

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been
downloaded from the King's Research Portal at
<https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



**An introduction to and edition of the Hugh Bigod eyre rolls, June 1258 - February 1259
: P.R.O. Just 1/1187 & Just 1/873.**

Hershey, Andrew H

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it
may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This is the second of two volumes to the thesis: An Introduction to and Edition of the
Hugh Bigod Eyre Rolls, June 1258-February 1259: P.R.O. Just 1/1187 & Just 1/873

by

Andrew H. Hershey

submitted for the degree of Ph. D. at

King's College, London

University of London

October 1991



Table of Contents

VOLUME 1

Introduction

Title Page.....	1
Thesis Abstract	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Dedication.....	4
Table of Contents	5
I Preface	6
II Why Bigod?.....	10
III The Eyre and the Program of Reform.....	26
IV. Select Cases from Hugh Bigod's First Eyre: Just 1/1187	45
V. Select Cases from Surrey and Kent: The Picture Presented by Just 1/873	58
VI. The Effectiveness of Hugh Bigod as Justiciar of England.....	79
VII. The Documents	98
VIII. Notes on Text and Translation.....	105

Appendices

Appendix I: Counties in which Hugh Bigod Sat to Hear Pleas Between June 1258-February 1259 and their Last Visitation.....	108
Appendix II: Distribution of Pleas from Just 1/1187.....	108
Appendix III: General Information on the <i>Querelae</i> in the Eyre Rolls of Hugh Bigod	109
Appendix IVA: Index to the <i>Querelae</i> found on Just 1/1187	110
Appendix IVB: Index to the <i>Querelae</i> found on Just 1/873.....	113
Appendix V: Material Relating to the Shere Incident taken from Just 1/874, m. 31.....	118
Appendix VI: Just 1/1187 Frequency of Civil Pleas	122
Appendix VII: Just 1/38 Frequency of Civil Pleas from the Berkshire Eyre of 1248.....	124
Appendix VIII: Chronological Ordering of Cases from Just 1/1187 & Just 1/873	125
Appendix IX: Index to Rolls Just 1/1187 and Just 1/873.....	126

<u>Bibliography</u>	175
---------------------------	-----

Edited Texts:

Appendix A: Just 1/1187	181
-------------------------------	-----

VOLUME 2

Appendix B: Just 1/873.....	432
-----------------------------	-----

Roll Wrapper to Just 1/873 (sown to tail of m. 9)

**PLEAS OF ASSIZES AND QUERELAE AND THE INQUIRIES OF THE FOUR KNIGHTS
BEFORE HUGH BIGOD JUSTICIAR OF ENGLAND IN THE FORTY-THIRD YEAR OF
THE REIGN OF KING HENRY SON OF KING JOHN, IN THE COUNTIES OF SURREY
AND KENT.**

The above is a translation of the roll wrapper, whose basic layout appears below.

Dockets by Arthur Agarde [c. 1602]:

Surrie) (il)	16 th century process mark Assize et
Querel'		
Kent }		Anno xliii ^{tio} H. tercii

The following label is in a 13th century hand.

**Placita de assisis et Querelis et inquisitionibus quatuor militum
coram Hugone Bygot Justiciario Anglie, Anno regni regis
Henrici filii regis Johannis Quadragessimo tercio In Comitatibus Surr' et
Kant'.**

Further Dockets by Agarde:

xliiii	Surr' (il)	(il)	(il)	Anno
					(il)	et (
il)							

The following title is in a 13th century hand.

(il)	(il)	tercius	Inquisitiones	Surr'	Kant'
---	-----	---	-----	---------	---------------	-------	-------

Further Dockets by Agarde:

tercii	Anno xliiii ^{tio} H.
--------	-------------------------------

The following word is in a 13th century hand.

BIGOD

Assise et Jurate Capte Coram H. le Bygod Justiciario Anglie apud Bermund' In Comitatu Surr' in Crastino sancti Edmundi Regis anno xliii.

Assizes and Jury-Pleas Taken before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England at Bermondsey in the County of Surrey on the Morrow of the Feast of Saint Edmund the King Year 43 [21 November 1258].

B1.(Surr', T) Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes de Gatesden' injuste etc. disseisivit Gilbertum filium Willelmi de Colevill' de libero tenemento suo in Kersaulton' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de uno mesuagio, una carucata terre et uno molendino aquatico cum pertinenciis. Et Johannes venit. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicit quod quidam Radulfus filius Willelmi de Colevill' feoffavit ipsum de predictis tenementis, unde dicit quod si aliqua disseisina predicto Gilberto inde facta fuit, hoc fuit per predictum Radulfum et non per ipsum. Et similiter dicit quod predictus Gilbertus nunquam fuit in seisinā de predictis tenementis ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Et Gilbertus quesitus qualiter clamat liberum tenementum in predictis mesuagio, molendino et terra, dicit quod revera quidam Willelmus de Colevill' avus ipsius Gilberti feoffavit Willelmum de Colevill' juniorem filium suum et patrem ipsius Gilberti cuius heres ipse est de predictis mesuagio, molendino et terra tenenda de capitale domino feodi illius. Ita quod predictus Willelmus junior per feoffamentum illud fuit in seisinā de predictis tenementis circiter per tres annos quousque obiit. Et post mortem ipsius Willelmi, seisivit predictus Willelmus avus predicta tenementa in manum suam ratione custodie cum predicto Gilberto filio et herede ipsius Willelmi junioris eo quod ipse fuit infra etatem, et sic tenuit tenementa illa nomine custodie circiter per tres annos. Et postmodum venit predictus Radulfus de Colevill' filius ipsius Willelmi avi postnatus et tantum fecit versus ipsum Willelmum avum, quod idem Willelmus feoffavit ipsum Radulfum de omnibus predictis tenementis. Qui eadem tenementa tenuit per aliquod tempus per feoffamentum illud. Et in processu temporis percepit idem Radulfus quod predictus Willelmus avus pater suus nichil juris habuit in eisdem tenementis nisi ratione custodie cum predicto Gilberto filio predicti Willelmi junioris et accessit ad predictum Willelmum patrem suum et reddidit ei omnia predicta tenementa de quibus ipsum prius feoffaverat per cartam suam de quietaclamacio quam predictus Gilbertus profert et que hoc testatur. Et dicit quod (postⁱ) reddicionem illam tenuit predictus Willelmus avus predicta tenementa in manu sua ratione custodie cum predicto Gilberto circiter per quatuor annos, quousque predictus Willelmus avus obiit. Et post mortem ipsius Willelmi seisivit predictus Johannes de Gatesden' predicta tenementa in manum suam ratione custodie cum predicto Gilberto, eo quod idem Johannes tunc temporis tenuit omnes terras Ingerami de Fen(hil)ges capitalis dominus feodi illius in partibus illis in manu sua. Qui eadem tenementa tenuit nomine custodie circiter per tres annos. Et postmodum perquisivit predictus Radulfus quandam assisam nove [disseisine] de eisdem tenementis versus predictum Johannem de Gatesden' coram W. de Ebor' et sociis suis justiciariis itinerantibus hic. Ita quod per quandam collusionem factam inter ipsum Johannem et predictum Radulfum remanserunt predicta tenementa eidem Johanni in feodo per quoddam feoffamentum ipsius Radulfi. Et quod ita sit ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod quidam Willelmus de Colevill' senior aliquo tempore tenuit predicta tenementa in feodo et habuit duos filios scilicet quendam Willelmum de Colevill' patrem ipsius Gilberti antenatum et quendam Radulfum postnatum. Et dicunt quod predictus Willelmus senior feoffavit predictum Willelmum juniorem de omnibus predictis tenementis. Ita quod idem Willelmus fuit inde in seisinā per dimidium annum per predictum feoffamentum, et obiit inde seisitus. Et post mortem ipsius Willelmi seisivit predictus Willelmus senior predicta tenementa in manum suam ratione custodie eo quod predictus Gilbertus filius et heres ipsius Willelmi junioris fuit tunc infra etatem et tenuit tenementa illa nomine custodie circiter per octo annos. Et post mortem ipsius Willelmi senioris intravit predictus Radulfus in predicta tenementa, et fuit in seisinā per octo dies, et postea feoffavit predictum Johannem de Gatesden' de medietate predictae terre tantummodo, et retinuit sibi totum residuum predictorum mesuagii, terre et molendini et remansit inde in seisinā per quindecim dies. Et dicunt quod predictus Radulfus postea transtulit se ad partes remotas, et

venit predictus Johannes et intrusit se in totum residuum predictorum tenementorum. Et postea in processu temporis cum idem Radulfus redierat, arrainaivit ipse quandam assisam nove disseisine de predicto residuo eorumdem tenementorum versus eundem Johannem coram W. de Ebor' et sociis suis justiciariis itinerantibus in comitatu isto. Ita quod convenit inter eos quod predictus Radulfus remisit quietumclamavit de se et heredibus suis predicto Johanni et heredibus suis totum jus et clameum quod habuit in eisdem tenementis imperpetuum. Et quia convictum est per predictam assisam quod predictus Radulfus feoffavit predictum Johannem de predicta parte predictorum tenementorum et postmodo idem Johannes eiecit ipsum Radulfum de toto residuo postquam exstiterat inde in seisin per quindecim dies. Ita quod si aliqua disseisina eidem Gilberto facta esset hoc non fuit per ipsum Johannem immo per predictum Radulfum consideratum est quod predictus Johannes inde sine die. Et predictus Gilbertus nichil capiat per assisam istam et sit in *misericordia*¹ pro falso (clamore¹).
(*Dampna siquando. c. marce*^C)

B1.(Surrey, T) Did John de Gatesden disseise Gilbert son of William of Colevill of his free tenement in Carshalton? He complains that he has disseised him of one messuage, one carucate of land and one water-mill. John comes. He says nothing to stop the assize, except only that a certain Ralph son of William of Colevill enfeoffed him of the tenements. Wherefore, he says that if any disseisin was made to Gilbert it was made by Ralph and not by him. Likewise, he says that Gilbert was never in seisin of the tenements so that he could be disseised. On this he places himself on the assize.

Gilbert was asked how he claims a free tenement in the messuage, mill and land. He says that a certain William of Colevill, Gilbert's grandfather, enfeoffed William of Colevill junior, Gilbert's father whose heir he is, of the messuage, mill and land to hold of the chief lord of that fee. William junior, by that enfeoffment, was in seisin of the tenements for nearly three years until he died. After William's death, William, the grandfather, seized the tenements into his hand by reason of custody with Gilbert, son and heir of William junior, because Gilbert was under age. Thus, he held the tenements in the name of custody for three years. Afterwards, Ralph of Colevill, the grandfather's younger son, came and persuaded William to enfeoff Ralph of all the tenements, [and] by that enfeoffment, Ralph held the tenements for some time. During the course of time, Ralph learned that William, his father, had no right to the tenements except by reason of custody with Gilbert. He approached William his father and rendered all the tenements to him, which [tenements] he was previously enfeoffed of by his charter of quitclaim, which Gilbert produced and which testifies to this. He says that after that surrendering, William, the grandfather, held the tenements in his hand by reason of custody with Gilbert for nearly four years, until he died. After William's death, John de Gatesden seized the tenements into his hand by reason of custody with Gilbert, because John at that time held all the lands in those parts from Ingram of Fenhges chief lord of that fee. He held the tenements in custody for nearly three years. Afterwards, Ralph obtained an assize of novel disseisin concerning the same tenements against John de Gatesden before [William] of York and his colleagues justices itinerant. Thus, by a deception between John and Ralph the tenements remained to John in fee, by which he enfeoffed Ralph. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that William of Colevill senior held the tenements in fee for sometime. He had two sons, namely William of Colevill the first born, Gilbert's father, and Ralph, the latter born. They say that William senior enfeoffed William junior of all the tenements. Thus, William was in seisin for half a year by the enfeoffment. He thereafter died seized. After William's death, William senior seized the tenements into his hand by reason of custody, because Gilbert, William junior's son and heir, was then under age. He held the tenements in the name of custody for nearly eight years. After William senior's death, Ralph entered the tenements and was in seisin for eight days. Afterwards, he only enfeoffed John de Gatesden of half of the land, and he retained all the remainder of the messuage, land and mill to himself. Thereafter, he remained in seisin for fifteen days. They say that Ralph afterwards left for remote parts. John came and entered himself on all of the tenements. During the course of time, when Ralph returned, he arraigned an assize of novel disseisin against John

¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

concerning the remainder of the tenements, before [William] of York and his colleagues justices itinerant in this county. Thus, it [was] agreed between them that Ralph remit and quitclaim himself and his heirs to John and his heirs all right and claim which he had in the tenements in perpetuity. Since it is determined by the aforesaid assize that Ralph enfeoffed John of part of the tenements and later John ejected Ralph from all of the tenements after he had stood in seisin for fifteen days, thus if any disseisin was done to Gilbert on this it was not by John, rather by Ralph, so it is adjudged that John is without a day. Gilbert takes nothing by this assize and is in *mercy* for false claim.

[Cross-reference: B31, B32]

- B2.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus Pyguge et Willelmus le Pestur injuste etc. levaverunt quoddam fossatum in Karsaulton' ad nocumentum liberi tenementi Walteri de Kynardeleg' in eadem villa post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod ubi predictus Walterus habere solebat chaciam suam cum averiis suis ad quandam pasturam suam in eadem villa et similiter cariare blada et fena sua, (predictus²) Willelmus et Willelmus levaverunt predictum fossatum per quod impeditur quominus habere possit chaciam suam et blada et fena sua cariare sicut solebat. Et Willelmus et Willelmus veniunt. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat.

Juratores dicunt quod predicti Willelmus et Willelmus levaverunt predictum fossatum (in Karsaulton'¹) ad nocumentum liberi tenementi predicti Walteri in eadem villa injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictum fossatum prosternatur quantum fuerit ad nocumentum etc. Et ad custum predictorum Willelmi et Willelmi. Et ipsi in *misericordia*.² *Dampna dimidia marca. Totum clericis.*

- B2.(Surrey) Did William Pyguge and William le Pestur raise a dike in Carshalton to the nuisance of Walter of Kynnersley's free tenement? He complains that whereas he was accustomed to have his drove-way [to chase] his animals to his pasture in the vill and to cart his grain and hay, William and William raised a dike by which he is impeded from having his drove-way and carting his grain and hay as he was accustomed. William and William come. They say nothing to stop the assize.

The jurors say that William and William raised the dike in Carshalton to the nuisance of Walter's free tenement. So it is adjudged that the dike shall be reduced at [both their] cost in as much as it was a nuisance. They [are] in *mercy*. *Damages: a half mark, all to the clerks.*

- B3.(Surr') Magister Hospitii de Reygat' dat *dimidiam marcam*³ pro licencia concordandi cum Johanne de la Bisse de (placito assise mortis antecessoris¹). Et habeant chirographum etc.

- B3.(Surrey) The Master of the Hospital at Reigate gives a *half mark* for a licence to agree with John de la Bisse concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor. Let them have a chirograph.

- B4.(Surr', T) Reginaldus de Brettinghurst attachiatus fuit ad respondendum Radulfo de Lambeth' de placito quare vi et armis ipsum eiecit de uno mesuagio, centum acris terre, et Triginta acris prati cum pertinenciis in Pecham et Westgrenewyz que idem Radulfus tenuit ex dimissione Willelmi de Chabeneys ad terminum qui non dum preteriit (contra pacem¹) etc. Et unde predictus Radulfus queritur quod cum predictus Willelmus dimisset ei predicta tenementa tenenda a festo sancti Michaelis anno xl usque ad terminum (^{il}) annorum proximo sequentem completorum; predictus Reginaldus infra predictum scilicet in vigilia Nativitatis sancti Johannis Baptiste anno xlii vi et armis scilicet cum gladiis, arcubus et sagitiis et ipsum de eisdem tenementis eiecit. Unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam lx^a marcarum. Et inde producit sectam.

Et Reginaldus venit et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendit quod nullam injuriam ei fecit. Dicit enim quod revera ipse aliquo tempore dimisit predicta tenementa predicto Willelmo de Chabeneys tenenda a festo sancti Michaelis anno xli, usque

²Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

³Margin note by scribe, di. m. croosed out.

ad finem quatuor annorum proximo sequens completorum pro decem marcis annuatim ei reddendo, scilicet ad festum sancti Michaelis quinque marcas et ad Pascha quinque marcas. Ita quod [si] predictus Willelmus deficeret in solucione predictae firme ad aliquem predictorum terminorum; liceret eidem Reginaldum eadem tenementa ingredi et ea tenere quousque predicta firma ei plenarie persolueretur. Et dicit quod predictus defecit in solucione predictae firme ad Pascha anno xlii, scilicet de quinque marcis eidem ad terminum illum reddendo. Ideo secundum predictam convencionem intravit ipse in predicta tenementa. Et profert quandam partem cyrographi inter ipsum et predictum Willelmum confecti que predictam convencionem testatur. Et quod vi et armis nec aliquo alio modo contra pacem domini regis ipsum eiecit de predicta terra ponit se super patriam. Et [breaks off]

Et Radulfus dicit quod revera dedicere non potest quin ita convenit inter predictum Reginaldum et predictum Willelmum quod si in solucione predictae firme ad aliquem terminum deficeret; liceret eidem Reginaldo ingredi tenementa illa sicut predictum est, set dicit quod ipsemet per maum suam reddidit ei predictam firmam de termino Pasche, et quod nichil aretro est de illo termino. Et quod ita sit ponit se super patriam. Et (Radulfus^s) similiter, ideo fiat inde jurata. ----- Et juratores de consensu parcium electi dicunt super sacramentum quod predictus Willelmus non soluit predicto Reginaldo predictam firmam quinque marcarum ad predictum terminum Pasche. Ita quod predictus Reginaldus distrinxit predictum Radulfum per averia sua in predicto tenemento inventa pro predicto arreragio et eadem averia inparcare fecit in parco W. de Say de Grenewz et predictus Radulfus accessit ad ballivum predicti Willelmi et deliberari fecit averia illa. Et postmodo quia predictus Reginaldus non potuit habere predictam firmam intravit ipse in predictis tenementis secundum convencionem predictam. Et juratores quesiti quantum predictus Reginaldus percepit de exitibus predictorum tenementorum postquam eiecerat ipsum Radulfum; dicunt quod ad valenciam xi marcarum. Quesiti etiam que alia dampna predictus Radulfus habuit occasione detentionis predictorum tenementorum; dicunt quod ad valenciam unius marce in quod terra jacet inculta. Et quia predictus [leaves off abruptly]

B4.(Surrey, T) Reginald of Briddinghurst was attached to answer Ralph of Lambeth concerning a plea whereby he ejected him with force of arms [and] against the king's peace from one messuage, one hundred acres of land and thirty acres of meadow in Peckham and West Greenwich, which Ralph held by demise from William of Kaynes for a term which had not yet expired. Ralph complains that whereas William demised the tenement to him to hold from the feast of Saint Michael year 40 [29 September 1256] until the term of () complete years, Reginald within the aforesaid term, namely in the vigils of the Nativity of Saint John the Baptist year 42 [23 June 1258], ejected him from the tenements with force of arms, namely with swords and bows and arrows. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 60 marks. Thereon he produces suit.

Reginald comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that he made no injury to him. He also says that he once demised the tenement to William of Kaynes to hold, from the feast of Saint Michael year 40 [29 September 1256], until the end of the next four years to render yearly 10 marks to him, namely five marks at the feast of Saint Michael [29 September] and five marks at Easter. Thus, [if] William failed to pay the farm at any of the terms, Reginald might lawfully enter the tenements and hold them until the farm was fully paid. He says that the aforesaid failed to pay him the farm, namely the five marks at Easter year 42 [24 March 1258]. So according to the agreement, he entered the tenements. He produced a certain part of a chirograph made between himself and William which testifies to the agreement. Thus he [neither came] with force of arms to eject him from the land, nor [did he come] in any other way against the king's peace. On this he places himself on the assize.

Ralph says that he cannot deny the agreement between Reginald and William, that if he failed to pay the farm at any term Reginald might lawfully enter the tenement. But, he says that with his own hand he rendered the farm for the Easter term and he is not in arrears for that term. On this he places himself on the country. Reginald [does] likewise, so let there be a jury trial thereon. ----- The jurors elected by both parties say upon their oath that William did not pay Reginald the farm of five marks at the Easter term. Thus, Reginald distrained Ralph for the arrears through his beasts found on the tenement and he impounded the beasts in W[illiam] of Say's park of Greenwich. Ralph approached William's bailiff to free the

beasts. Afterwards, since Reginald was not able to have the farm he entered the tenements according to the agreement. The jurors [were] asked how much Reginald took from the outgoings of the tenements after he had ejected Ralph. They said [he took] 11 marks worth. Asked also what other damages Ralph had on the occasion, they said to the value of one mark, because the land lay fallow. Since the aforesaid

[Membrane 1d.]

B5.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Walterus le Bacheler injuste etc. disseisivit Willelmum de la Grave de libero tenemento suo in Roaude post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de duabus acris bosci cum pertinenciis. Et Walterus venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit quod predictus Willelmus nunquam fuit inde in seisin ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et de ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Walterus non disseisivit predictum Willelmum de predicto tenemento injuste etc. quia dicunt quod predictus Willelmus nunquam fuit inde in seisin ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et ideo consideratum [est] quod predictus Walterus inde sine die. Et Willelmus nichil capiat per assisam istam. Et sit in *miserecordia*⁴ pro falso clamore.

B5.(Surrey) Did Walter le Bacheler disseise William de la Grave of his free tenement in Roaude? He complains that he has disseised him of two acres of woods. Walter comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says that William was never in seisin, so that he could be disseised. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that Walter did not disseise William. They say William was never in seisin. So it is adjudged that Walter is without a day. William takes nothing by this assize and is in *mercy* for false claim.

B6.(Surr', T) Ass. ven rec. si Johannes de la Burgate Avunculus Willelmi filii Ade de la Burgate fuit seisitus in dominico etc. de viii¹⁰ acris terre cum pertinenciis in Godalming' die quo etc. Et si obiit post ultimam redditum etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Phillipus filius Nigelli tenet. Qui venit et dicit quod assisa non debet inde fieri quia bene cognovit quod predictus Johannes de cuius morte assisa ista arrainata est obiit seysitus de predicta terra ut de feodo. Et post terminum in brevi contentum. Set dicit quod post mortem predicti Johannis ipsemet Phillipus intravit (in¹) predictam terram ut frater predicti Johannis et heres eius propinquior. Et quia predictus Willelmus est infra etatem nec potest nec scit placitare; consideratum est (comunicatur⁸) rei veritas per assisam de parentela predictorum Willelmi et Phillipi. Post venit predictus et gratis respondit ad assisam et dicit quod predictus Willelmus nichil clamare potest in predicta terra de morte predicti Johannis. Quia dicit quod revera quidam Nigellus avus predicti Willelmi qui modo petit et pater ipsius Phillipi habuit tres filios scilicet quendam Adam quem procreavit de quadam Matilda prima uxore sua de quo exiit predictus Willelmus qui modo petit. Et predictum Johannem de cuius morte etc. et ipsum Phillipum de quadam Felicia secunda uxore sua unde desicut predictus Johannes de cuius morte etc. et ipse fuerunt fratres de eodem patre et eadem matre petit iudicium si predictus Willelmus aliquid potest clamare (potest^r) in predicta terra de morte predicti Johannis qui exivit de predicto Ada qui fuit frater predicti Johannis de (uno^c) patre tantum. Et hoc idem convictum est per assisam. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Phillipus inde sine die. Et predictus Willelmus nichil capiat per assisam istam set sit in *miserecordia*⁵ pro falso clamore perdonatur quia infra etatem etc.

B6.(Surrey, T) Was John de la Burgate uncle of William son of Adam de la Burgate seized in demesne of 8 acres of land in Godalming on the day? Philip son of Nigel holds the land. He comes and says that the assize ought not to be made since he readily acknowledges that John, concerning whose death this assize is arraigned, died seized of the land as of fee and after the term contained in the writ. But, he says that after John's death, he entered the land

⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

as John's brother and his nearest heir. Since William is underage nor does he know how to plead, so it is adjudged that the truth is to be made plain by an assize of parentage. Afterwards, [Philip] comes and freely answers the assize. He says that William is able to claim nothing in the land from John's death, since he says that a certain Nigel, the grandfather of William who now claims [the land], had three sons, namely Adam from Matilda his first wife, [father of] William who now claims, and John, and Philip from Felicia his second wife. Since the aforesaid John and he were brothers of the same father and mother, he requests judgement if William is able to claim anything in the land from only the father. This is determined by the assize. So it is adjudged that Philip is without a day. William takes nothing by this assize, but is in *mercy* for false claim. He is pardoned since he [is] underage.

B7.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Rogerus le Pestre frater Gilberti le Nappere fuit seysitus in dominico etc. de duabus solidis redditus cum pertinenciis in Kingeston' die quo etc. Et si obiit post ultimam redditum etc. Et si etc. Quem redditum Johannes le Fevre de Kingeston' et Alicia uxor eius tenent. Qui veniunt et nichil dicunt quare assisa remaneat ideo capiatur assisa.

Juratores dicunt quod quedam Matilda filia Rogeri aliquando tenuit predictum redditum et feofavit inde predictum Rogerum de cuius morte etc. Et dicunt quod predictus Rogerus obiit seysitus ut de feodo. Et post terminum in brevi contentum. Et quod predictus Gilbertus est heres eius propinquior. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Gilbertus recuperet saisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et predicti Johannes et Alicia in *miser cordia*⁶ perdonatur pro paupertate.

B7.(Surrey) Was Roger le Pestur brother of Gilbert le Napier seized in demesne of two shillings rent in Kingston on the day? John le Ferrer of Kingston and Alice his wife hold the rent. They come and say nothing to stop the assize, so the assize is taken.

The jurors say that a certain Matilda daughter of Roger once held the rent and enfeofed Roger. They say that Roger died seized as of fee and after the term contained in the writ, and Gilbert is his nearest heir. So it is adjudged that Gilbert recovers his seisin by view of the jurors. John and Alice [are] in *mercy*. They are pardoned out of poverty.

B8.(Surr') Gregorius Attestrete et Petronilla uxor eius qui tulerunt breve nove disseisine versus Ricardum de Gravene et Johannem le Mouner retraxerunt se ideo ipsi et plegii sui de proseguendo in *miser cordia*⁷ scilicet Willelmus le Poter de Clendon' et Willelmus le Monienur de Merwe.

B8.(Surrey) Gregory Attestreet and Petronilla his wife, who brought a writ of novel disseisin against Richard of Graveney and John le Monk, have withdrawn themselves. So they and their pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely William le Poter of Clandon and William le Moneyer of Merrow.

B9.(Surr') Johannes filius Odoni de la Hyde qui tulit breve mortis antecessoris versus Radulfum de Plukele de quatuor acris terre cum pertinenciis in Wetedon' non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *miser cordia*⁸ scilicet Willelmus le Prunr de Cateram et Walterus filius Greylaud. Post venit Johannes ideo nichil de *miser cordia*.

B9.(Surrey) John son of Odo de la Hide who brought a writ of mort d' ancestor against Ralph of Pluckley concerning four acres of land in Wotton, has not prosecuted his suit. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely William le Prunner of Caterham and Walter son of Greyland. Afterwards, John came, so he is not in *mercy*.
[Cross-reference: ? B50]

B10.(Suff') Anabila uxor Thome filio Aucheri cognovit quod ratum habet quod Johannes Weland'

⁶Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁷Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁸Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

et heredes sui habeant et teneant de predictis Thome et Amabile et heredibus ipsius Amabile manerium de Westreud cum omnibus pertinentiis suis quod fuit Radulfi de Pesehale patris ipsius Amabile per servicium C solidorum inde reddendorum per annum. Et sicut continebatur in cyrographum inde inter eos conficiendo etc.

B10.(Suffolk) Anabel wife of Thomas son of Aucher, acknowledges that she has the share which John Weylond and his heirs will have and will hold of Thomas and Anabel and Anabel's heirs from the manor of Westfield which was Ralph of Pershall's, Anabel's father, by service of 100 shillings per year. As is contained in the chirograph made between them.
[Cross-reference: B347, see also CP 25(1) 214/26/6]

B11.(Midd', T) Preceptum fuit vicecomiti quod assumptum secum probis et legalis (homminibus^s) de visneto de Stanwe in propria persona sua accederet ad terram Radulfi Jocelyn de Parco infra parochiam de Stanwell' et per eorum sacramentum appreciari facere catallas et bona in eadem terra inventa. Et capte sufficiente securitate a prefato Radulfo quod domino rege ad mandatum suum de pretio eorundem catallorum et bonorum responderet, et similiter de commodo et exitibus de predicta terra interim proveniente; predicto Radulfo seisinam de predicta terra una cum predictis catallis et bovis existentis in eadem; sine dilatione habere faciat. Et pretium eorundem catallorum et quo die predictum Radulfum posuerit in seisinam de predicta terra; scire faceret ad hunc diem sub sigillo suo et sigillorum eorum per quorum sacramentum etc. Et vicecomes mandavit quod die veneris proxima post festum sancti Edmundi Martir (proximo preterito¹) accessit ipse ad predictam terram et per sacramentum proborum etc. appreciari fecit predicta catalla et bona in terra illa inventa. Que appreciata fuerunt ad triginta quatuor marcas. Et quod eodem die positus fuit predictus Radulfus in seisinam de predicta terra. Et invenit hos plegios, scilicet Radulfum Argent, Robertum de Cruce, Radulfum Dayrell' de Hanewurth', Johannem li Northe, Radulfum Coleman et Robertum del Perer quod ad mandatum domini regis de predicto pretio et similiter de commodo et exitibus de predicta terra interim proveniente responderet etc.

B11.(Middlesex, T) The sheriff was ordered that he assemble proven and law-worthy men from the neighbourhood of Stanwell [and] in person enter Ralph Jocelin of Park's land within the parish of Stanwell and on their oath appraise the chattels and goods found on the land. He shall [also] take enough security from Ralph that at the king's order he will answer concerning the value of the chattels and goods and likewise concerning the profit and outgoings arising from the land in the meantime. And without delay [he should] make Ralph have seisin of the land, chattels and goods existing on the land. The value of the chattels and on what day he placed Ralph in seisin of the land he shall make known on this day under his seal and the seals through whom the oath etc. The sheriff answered that on the next Friday following the feast of Saint Edmund the Martyr [22 November 1258], he himself entered the land and through the oath of proven [men] appraised the chattels and goods found there. They were appraised at thirty-four marks and on that same day Ralph was placed in seisin. He found these pledges that at the king's order he shall answer for the value of the land and the outgoings arising in the meantime, namely Ralph Silver, Robert de Cruce, Ralph Dayrel of Hanworth, John le Northe, Ralph Coleman and Robert del Pereres.

B12.(Sumers') Matilda de la Dune cognovit quod debet Stephano de la Dune Decem marcas de fine inter eos facto de quibus ei reddet ad Pascha anno xliii v marcas. Et ad festum Nativitatis sancti Johannis Baptiste proximo sequens; v marcas. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et ad maiorem securitatem invenit hunc plegium scilicet Stephanum de Assewell' qui presens est et concedit quod si predicta Matilda non solvat predictos denarios ad predictos terminos, quod vicecomes Hertford' faciat de terris etc.

B12.(Somerset) Matilda de la Dune acknowledges that she owes Stephen de la Dune ten marks for a fine made between them, concerning which she shall render 5 marks to him at Easter year 43 [13 April 1259] and 5 marks at the following Nativity of Saint John the Baptist [24 June 1259]. If she does not, she grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from her lands. For the major security, she found this pledge, namely Stephen of Ashwell. He is present and

grants that if Matilda does not render the money at the aforesaid terms, the sheriff of *Hertfordshire* may levy [the amount] from his lands.

B13.(Sumers') Eadem Matildam dat *dimidiam marcam*⁹ pro licencia concordandi cum Stephano de la Dune de placito assise mortis antecessoris. Et habent cyrographum etc.

B13.(Somerset) The same Matilda gives a *half mark* for a licence to agree with Stephen de la Dune concerning an assize of mort d' ancestor. Let them have a chirograph.

B14.(Sussex') Magister Galfridus de Derham cognovit quod recepit de Davido de Jarpenvill' vicecomite Sussex' decem et septem marcas de viginti marcis in quibus Walterus de Clifford' ei debuit de annuo reddito quinque marcarum et arreragio eiusdem redditus etc.

B14.(Sussex) Master Geoffrey of Dereham acknowledges that he received from David of Jarpenvill sheriff of Sussex, seventeen marks of twenty marks which Walter of Clifford owes him, concerning a yearly rent of five marks and [for] arrears to the same rent.

[Membrane 2]

B15. Ass. ven. rec. si Hugo Schacprork', Johannes le Moyne, Rogerus le Provost, Willelmus Schaperun et Thomas le Berker injuste etc. disseisiverunt Adam de Basinges et Johannam uxorem eius de libero tenemento suo in Benchesham et Croynden' post primam etc. Et unde queruntur quod disseisiverunt eos de xii^{cim} marcis redditus cum pertinentiis, de quibus Walterus de Frowik' ipsos Adam et Johannam feofavit percipiendas per manum predicti Hugoni Schacepork' de quibusdam terris et tenementis que idem Hugo tenuit in predictis villis.---- Et predicti Johannes le Moyne, Rogerus et Thomas veniunt et nichil dicunt quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicunt quod nulla pars predicti redditus est in Croynden'. Dicunt etiam quod predicti Adam et Johanna nunquam inde fuerunt in seisin. Ita quod inde potuerunt disseisiri. Et inde ponunt se super assisam. Et Hugo et Willelmus non venerunt, nec fuerunt attachiati quia non fuerunt inventi. Ideo procedat assisa versus eos per defaultam. Juratores dicunt quod predictus Johannes et omnes alii preter predictos Hugonem (et Willelmumⁱ) disseisiverunt predictos Adam et Johannam de predictis tenementis quod posuerunt in viso suo sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Adam et Johanna recuperent seisinam suam per visum juratorum et Johannes, Rogerus et Thomas in *miserericordia*¹⁰. Et Adam et Johanna similiter in misericordia pro falso clamore versus predictos Hugonem et Willelmum. Post venit predictus Johannes et offert domino Rege *unam marcam*¹¹ pro habenda jurata xxiiii^{or} ad convincendum xii. Et recipitur per plegium Rogeri de Northwud'. Plegii de proseguendo Johannes de la Fulwell' et Walterus de Haddescombe. *Dampna. C solidi.*

B15.[Surrey] Did Hugh of Chaceporc, John le Monk, Roger le Provost, William Caperun and Thomas le Berker disseise Adam of Basing and Joan his wife of their free tenement in Besham and Croydon? They complain that they have disseised them of 12 marks rent, concerning which Walter of Frowyk had enfeoffed Adam and Joan to be collected by the hand of Hugh of Chaceporc from lands and tenements which Hugh held in the villis. John le Monk, Roger and Thomas come and say nothing to stop the assize, except only that they say that no part of the rent is in Croydon. They also say that Adam and Joan were never in seisin, so that they could be disseised. On this they place themselves on the assize. Hugh and William have not come nor were they attached since they were not found. So the assize proceeds against them by default.

The jurors say that John and all the others, except Hugh and William, disseised Adam and Joan of the tenements. So it is adjudged that Adam and Joan recover their seisin. John, Roger and Thomas [are] in *mercy*. Adam and Joan [are] in mercy for false claim against

⁹Margin note by scribe, *dimidia marca* crossed out.

¹⁰Margin note by scribe, *mie'* crossed out.

¹¹Margin note by scribe, *i marca* crossed out.

Hugh and William. Afterwards, John comes and offers the king *one mark* for a jury of 24 to attain the 12. It is received by pledge of Roger of Northwood. The pledges for prosecuting [are] John de la Fulwell and Walter of Addiscombe. *Damages: 100 shillings.*
[Cross-reference: B52]

- B16. Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes filius Willelmi le Provost injuste etc. obstruxit quandam viam in Hasshe ad nocumentum liberi tenementi Petri Gurnard in eadem villa post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod ubi predictus Petrus solebat cariare cum Carettis et Carris suis et Chaciare averia sua ad terras suas (per quamdam viam¹) in predicta villa de Hasshe. Idem Johannes obstruxit illam viam quominus Cariare et Chaciare potest per illam viam sicut solebat. Et Johannes venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Johannes obstruxit predictam viam ad nocumentum libri tenementi ipsius Petri injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicta via aperiatur ad custum ipsius Johannis per visum recognitorum. Et predictus Johannes in *misericordia*¹². *Dampna. xx solidi. Totum clericis.*

- B16.[Surrey] Did John son of William le Provost obstruct a certain way in Hatch to the nuisance of Peter Gurnard's free tenement in the same vill? He complains that whereas he was accustomed to cart with his hand-carts and carts and to chase his beasts to his lands on that way, John obstructed that way by which the less he is able to cart and chase as he was accustomed. John comes and says nothing to stop the assize.

The jurors say that John obstructed the way to the nuisance of Peter's free tenement. So it is adjudged that the way is to be opened at John's cost. John [is] in *mercy*. *Damages: 20 shillings, all to the clerks.*

- B17.(Kant', vacat quia alibi, large cross over the entry.) Ricardus persona Ecclesie de Netelested' qui tulit breve de transgressione versus Bartholomeum de Oteringber' et Rogerum de la Forde non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia* scilicet Adam de Staundon' et Johannes Clericus.

- B17.(Kent, cancelled, large cross over entry) Richard parson of the church of Nettlestead, who brought a writ of trespass against Bartholomew of Oteringbury and Roger de la Ford, has not prosecuted. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely Adam of Standen and John Clerk.

- B18.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Stephanus filius Roberti injuste etc. disseisivit Idoneam filiam Roberti de Bornwell' de libero tenemento suo in Suthwark' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eam de uno mesuagio cum pertinenciis. Et Stephanus venit. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicit quod ipsamet est in seisin de mesuagio illo.

Juratores dicunt quod quidam Robertus pater predictae Idonee aliquo tempore tenuit predictum mesuagium in feodo et feoffavit inde predictam Idoneam filiam suam per longum tempus ante mortem suam. Ita quod ipsa Idonea fuit inde in pacifica seisin usque diem dominicam proximo preteritam quando predictus Stephanus ipsam inde eiecit, unde dicunt presice quod predictus Stephanus disseisivit eam de predicto mesuagio injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicta Idonea recuperet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Stephanus in *misericordia*¹³. Post venit predictus Stephanus et offert domino rege *i marcam*¹⁴ pro habenda jurata xxiiii^{or} ad convicendum xii. Et recipitur per plegium Willelmi de Burgwell'. *Dampna. iiii solidi.*

- B18.(Surrey) Did Stephen son of Robert disseise Idonea daughter of Robert of Barnwell of her free tenement in Southwark? She complains that he disseised her of one messuage. Stephen comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says she is not in seisin of that messuage.

The jurors say that Robert, Idonea's father, once held the messuage in fee and enfeoffed

¹²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁴Margin note by scribe, i marca crossed out.

Idonea his daughter a long time before his death. Thus, Idonea was in peaceful seisin until the following Sunday when Stephen ejected her. Wherefore, they say exactly this, that Stephen disseised her of the messuage. So it is adjudged that Idonea recovers her seisin. Stephen [is] in *mercy*. Afterwards, Stephen offers the king *1 mark* for a jury of 24 to attain the 12. It is received by pledge of William of Burghwell. *Damages: 4 shillings*.

B19.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Mabilia filia Rogeri le Prestre, Edmundus frater eius et Willelmus de Burton' injuste etc. disseisiverunt Walterum de Muleseye de libero tenemento suo in Bedinton' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de quindecim acris terre cum pertinenciis. Et Mabilia et alii non venerunt, nec fuerunt attachiati quia non fuerunt inventi. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eos per defaultam.

Juratores dicunt quod predicta terra aliquo tempore fuit jus et perquisitum predictae Mabilie et feoffavit inde quendam Nicholaum filium suum tenenda de predicto Waltero capitale domino feodi illius. Et dicunt quod idem Nicholaus Bastardus fuit et obiit seisitus de predicta terra sine herede [de] se. Ita cum quod per duos dies ante mortem suam confecit ipsa predictae Mabilie matri sue quoddam scriptum de feoffamento de predicta terra, set ipsa nullam inde habuit seisinam ante mortem ipsius Nicholai. Et dicunt quod post statim post mortem eiusdem Nicholai posuit predictus Walterus se in seisina de predicta terra tamquam de eschaeta sua, eo quod predictus Nicholaus qui de eo tenuit Bastardus fuit et obiit sine herede de se. Et inde fuit in seisina a festo sancti Gregorii in Quadragesimo usque ad festum sancti Barnabe apostolici eodem anno quod predicti Mabilia, Rogerus et alii ipsum injuste et sine iudicio inde disseisiverunt. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Walterus recuperet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Mabilia et alii in *misericordia*¹⁵.----- Et quia predicti Mabilia et alii nullam terram habuerunt in comitatu isto, nec catalla de quibus predicta dampna fieri possunt. Et testatum est quod habuerunt ad sufficientem in Comitatu Oxon', ideo preceptum est vicecomiti Oxon' quod de terris etc. fieri faciat predictam marcam et illam habeat in Octabis sancti Hillarii. *Dampna. i marca. Totum clericis*.

B19.(Surrey) Did Mabel daughter of Roger le Pestur, Edmund her brother and William of Burton disseise Walter of Molesey of his free tenement in Beddington? He complains that they have disseised him of fifteen acres of land. Mabel and the others have not come, nor were they attached since they were not found. So the assize is taken against them by default.

The jurors say that the land was once Mabel's right and perquisite. She enfeoffed Nicholas her son to hold of Walter chief lord of that fee. They say that Nicholas was a bastard and died seized of the land without heirs. Thus, two days before his death he made a deed of enfeoffment to Mabel concerning the land, but she did not have seisin before Nicholas' death. They say that immediately after Nicholas' death, Walter placed himself in seisin of the land as his echeat, because Nicholas, who held of him, was a bastard and died without heir. Thereafter, he was in seisin from the feast of Saint Gregory in Lent [12 March] until the feast of Saint Barneby the Apostle [11 June] of the same year, when Mabel, Roger and the others disseised him. So it is adjudged that Walter recovers his seisin. Mabel and the others [are] in *mercy*. Since Mabel and the others have no land in this county, nor chattels from which the damages can be raised and it is testified that they have enough in the county of *Oxfordshire*, so the sheriff of Oxfordshire is ordered to raise the mark from the lands. He shall have [the mark] in the octaves of Saint Hillary [20 January]. *Damages: 1 mark, all to the clerks*.

B20.(Surr', T) Ass. ven. rec. si Matilda de Gosestrod' amita Gilberti de la Greston' fuit seisita in dominico suo etc. de duabus virgatis terre cum pertinenciis in Wudeton' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Herbertus de Sumerbur' tenet. Qui venit. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod predictus Gilbertus nullus heres esse potest quia dicit quod villanus est, et similiter predicta Matilda villana fuit. Et quod ipsa Matilda nichil habuit in predicta terra nisi ratione cuiusdam Manriti quondam viri sui cuius jus et perquisitum predicta terra fuit. Et quod ita sit ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera quidam Manritius et predicta Matilda feoffati fuerunt de

¹⁵Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

predicta terra sibi et heredibus de corporibus ipsorum (exennitibus^S) et dicunt quod ipsi obierunt sine heredibus de corporibus ipsorum per quod dicunt quod predicta terra reverti debuit ad Widonium filium Nicholai Malemeins qui eos feoffavit de predicta terra. Dicunt etiam quod avum predicti Gilberti et pater eiusdem Gilberti villani fuerunt et idem Gilbertus similiter villanus [est]. Unde dicunt quod non potuit (disseisiri de aliquo libero tenemento^C) (clamare aliquod liberum tenementum.ⁱ) Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Herbertus inde sine die. Et Gilbertus in *misericordia*¹⁶ pro falso clamore per plegium [blank]

B20.(Surrey, T) Was Matilda of Gostrode aunt of Gilbert de la Gretstanes seized in demesne of two virgates of land in Wotton on the day? Herbert of Summersbury holds the land. He comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that Gilbert is not able to be an heir, since Gilbert is a villein. Likewise, Matilda was a villein. Matilda had nothing in that land, except by reason of Manriti, once her husband, whose right and perquisite the land was. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that Manriti and Matilda were enfeoffed of the land themselves and the heirs begotten from their bodies. They say that [if] they died without an heir of their bodies the land ought to revert to Guy son of Nicholas Malemains, who enfeoffed them of the land. They also say that Gilbert's grandfather and Gilbert's father were villeins and Gilbert [is] likewise a villein. Wherefore, they say he cannot claim any free tenement. So it is adjudged that Herbert is without a day. Gilbert [is] in *mercy* for false claim by pledge

B21.(Surr') Abbas de (Lattelye^S) ponit loco suo fratrem Johannem de Den' monachum suum vel Walterum de Es versus Johannem de Waren' et Johannem filium Johannis de placito assise ultime presentacionis etc.

B21.(Surrey) The abbot of Netley appoints as his attorneys brother John of Dean, his monk, or Walter of Es against John de Warenne and John son of John concerning an assize of last presentment.

B22.(Surr' et breve remaneat penes vicecomiti) Ass. ven. rec. si Thomas le Chaumberleng' pater Radulfi fuit seisitus in dominico suo ut de feodo de uno mesuagio cum pertinenciis in Wodemersthorn' die quo etc. et si etc. Quod mesuagium Willelmus filius Ricardi le Rus et Basilia uxor eius tenent. Qui veniunt et vocant inde warantum Willelmum de Fortibus habeant eum die *dominica*.

B22.(Surrey, the writ remains with the sheriff) Was Thomas le Chamberlain father of Ralph seized in demesne as of fee of one messuage in Woodmansterne on the day? William son of Richard le Rous and Basilia his wife hold the messuage. They come and call to warrant William de Fortibus. They shall have him on *Sunday*.

B23. Ass. ven rec. si Radulfus filius Willelmi le Taliur injuste etc. disseisivit Willelmum Serle de libero tenemento suo in Micham post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de uno mesuagio et una acra terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis. Et Radulfus non venit nec fuit attachiatus quia non fuit inventus. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eum per defaultam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Radulfus disseisivit predictum Willelmum de libero tenemento suo quod posuit in viso suo (injuste etc.ⁱ) sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum [est] quod predictus Willelmus recuperet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum et Radulfus in *misericordia*¹⁷. *Dampna ii solidi. Totum clericis.*

B23.[Surrey] Did Ralph son of William le Tailor disseise William Serle of his free tenement in Mitcham? He complains that he has disseised him of one messuage and one and a half acres of land. Ralph has not come nor was he attached since he was not found. So the assize is taken against him by default.

¹⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

The jurors say that Ralph disseised William. So it is adjudged that William recovers his seisin. Ralph [is] in *mercy*. *Damages: 2 shillings, all to the clerks.*

B24.(Surr') Ass ven. rec. si Rogerus de Kyngeston' Capellanus frater Gilberti le Nepere fuit seisitus in dominico suo ut de feodo de duabus solidis redditus cum pertinenciis in Kyngeston' die quo etc. Et si etc. (Et si etc.¹) Quem redditus Johannes le Fevre tenet. Qui venit et dicit quod non potest ei inde respondere sine Alicia uxore sua. Quia dicit quod ipse et Alicia uxor sua simul feofati sunt de predicto redditu et profert cartam sub nomine Matilde filie Aluene per quam feofavit predictos Johannem et Aliciam uxorem eius de predicto redditu sicut carta testatur. Et Gilbertus non potest hoc dedicere. Ideo Johannes inde sine die et Gilbertus in *misericordia*¹⁸ (pro falso clamore¹) et perquirat sibi per aliud breve si voluerit.

B24.(Surrey) Was Roger of Kingston, a chaplain, brother of Gilbert le Napier seized in demesne of two shillings rent in Kingston on the day? John le Ferrer holds the rent. He comes and says he cannot respond without his wife Alice, since he says that he and Alice were enfeoffed of the rent. He produced a charter in the name of Matilda daughter of Arlene by which she enfeoffed John and Alice of the rent as the charter testifies. Gilbert cannot deny this. So John is without a day. Gilbert [is] in *mercy* for false claim. Let him pursue by another writ if he wishes.

[Membrane 2d.]

B25.(Surr') Ass ven rec. si Petrus le Porter, Gilbertus Swetheret, Rogerus Swytheret et Ricardus Bowyer injuste etc. disseisiverunt Johannem le Free de libero tenemento suo in Clendon' regis post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de duabus acris terre cum pertinenciis. Et nullus eorum venerunt preter predictum Petrum. Et Gilbertus fuit attachiatus per Hugonem de Thone et Petrum de Thone. Et Rogerus per Gilbertum Swythered' et Robertum (de¹) Irlaund. Ideo ipsi in *misericordia*¹⁹ et procedat assisa versus eos per defaultam. Et predictus Ricardus non fuit attachiatus quia non fuit inventus. Ideo procedat assisa versus eum per defaultam. Et Petrus nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicit quod predictus Johannes non potest disseisiri de aliquo libero tenemento, eo quod villanus est et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Petrus et alii non disseisiverunt eundem Johannem de predicto tenemento etc. eo quod dicunt quod idem Johannes non potest disseisiri de aliquo libero tenemento quia villanus est. Ideo consideratum est quod Petrus inde sine die etc.

Johannes nichil capiat per assisam istam set sit in *misericordia*²⁰ pro falso clamore per plegium [blank]

B25.(Surrey) Did Peter le Porter, Gilbert Swetheret, Roger Swytheret and Richard Bower disseise John le Free of his free tenement in West Clandon? He complains that they have disseised him of two acres of land. None of them came, except Peter. Gilbert was attached by Hugh of Tony and Peter of Tony, Roger by Gilbert Swythered and Robert of Ireland. So they [are] in *mercy*. The assize proceeds against them by default. Richard was not attached since he was not found. So the assize proceeds against him by default. Peter says nothing to stop the assize, except only that John cannot be disseised of any free tenement because he is a villein. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that Peter and the others have not disseised John of the tenement, because John cannot be disseised of any free tenement since he is a villein. So it is adjudged that Peter is without a day. John takes nothing by this assize, but is in *mercy* for false claim by pledge

B26.(Surr') Ass. ven rec. si Gregorius attestode injuste etc. levavit quoddam fossatum in Egham ad nocumentum libri tenementi Johannis de Sudynton' in eadem villa post primam etc. Et

¹⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁹Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

²⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

unde queritur quod per predictum fossatum impeditur quod non potest venire ad communam pasture sue adeo comode sicut solebat. Et Gregorius venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit quod levavit dictum fossatum de assensu et voluntate predicti Johannis et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Gregorius levavit dictum fossatum ad nocumentum libri tenementi dicti Johannis sine assensu et voluntate ipsius Johannis. Ideo consideratum est quod predictum fossatum prosternatur ad custum predicti Gregorii quantum fuerit ad nocumentum per visum recognitorum et Gregorius in *miser cordia*.²¹ *Dampna dimidia marca. Medietas clericis.*

B26.(Surrey) Did Gregory atte street raise a dike in Egham to the nuisance of John of Siddington's free tenement in the same vill? He complains that by the aforesaid dike he is unable to go to his common pasture as easily as he was accustomed. Gregory comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he raised the dike with John's permission and will. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that Gregory raised the dike without John's permission or will, to the nuisance of John's free tenement. So it is adjudged that the dike is to be reduced at Gregory's cost in as much as it was a nuisance. Gregory [is] in *mercy*. *Damages: a half mark, half to the clerks.*

B27.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes de Keringham injuste etc. disseisivit Willelmum Russel Gilbertum de la Risbrigg' et Editham uxorem euis de libero tenemento suo in Brumleg' post primam etc. Et unde queruntur quod disseisivit eos de duabus partibus unius acre et dimidie terre cum pertinentiis in eadem. Et Johannes venit et cognovit disseisinam. Ideo consideratum est quod predicti Willelmus Gilbertus et Editha recuperent seisinam suam et Johannes *custodiatur*.²² *Dampna relaxantur. Postea venit predictus Johannes et finem fecit per dimidiam marcam.*²³

B27.(Surrey) Did John of Keringham disseise William Russel, Gilbert of Ricebridge and Edith his wife of their free tenement in Bromley? They complain that he has disseised them of two parts of one and a half acres of land. John comes and acknowledges disseisin. So it is adjudged that William, Gilbert and Edith recover their seisin. John is to be taken into custody. The damages are nullified. Afterwards, John came and made fine for a *half mark*.

B28.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus filius Willelmus le Wodie, Willelmus le Clerk et Rogerus de Horne injuste etc. disseisiverunt Matildam filiam Stephani de la Hich' de libero tenemento suo in Mersham post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eam de uno mesuagio et sexdecim acris terre cum pertinentiis. Et Willelmus le Clerk non venit nec fuit attachiatus quia non fuit inventus. Ideo procedat assisa versus eum per defaultam. Et Willelmus filius Willelmi et Rogerus veniunt et dicunt quod assisa non debet inde fieri quia dicunt quod predictum tenementum fuit jus cuiusdam Roberti avi ipsius Willelmi cuius heres etc. Ita quod predictus Robertus misit pro dicto Willelmo ut cum eo staret in vita eius et post mortem eius haberet predictum tenementum ut heres eius propinquior. Ita quod predictus Willelmus statim post mortem predicti Roberti remansit in seisina de predicto tenemento ut heres eius propinquior et fuit in pacifica seisina per tres septimanas quousque predicta Matilda venit ad predictum tenementum quodam die circa horam nonam et quamcito dictus Willelmus percepit ipsam ibidem esse fecit per ballivos eiusdem ville ipsam amoveri et quod non ipsam disseisiri ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predicti Willelmus et alii non disseisiverunt predictam Matildam (de predicto tenemento¹) quia dicunt quod predictus Willelmus fuit in seisina de predicto tenemento post mortem predicti Roberti ut heres eius propinquior per tres septimanas et amplius et quamcito dicta Matilda posuerat se in seisina de predicto tenemento amota fuit per ballivum eiusdem ville. Ita quod nunquam fuit inde in seisina ut de libero tenemento.

²¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²²Margin note by scribe, c. crossed out.

²³Margin note by scribe, di. m. crossed out.

Ideo consideratum est quod predicti Willelmus et alii inde sine die et predicta Matilda nichil capiat per assisam istam et sit in misericordia pro falso clamore misericordia perdonatur pro paupertate eius etc.

B28.(Surrey) Did William son of William le Woody, William le Clerk and Roger of Horne disseise Matilda daughter of Stephen de la Hitchin of her free tenement in Merstham? She complains that they have disseised her of one messuage and sixteen acres of land. William le Clerk has not come nor was he attached since he was not found. So the assize proceeds against him by default. William son of William and Roger come and say that the assize ought not to be made, since they say the aforesaid tenement was the right of Robert, William's grandfather, whose heir [he is]. Thus, Robert sent for William as one who stands with him in his lifetime and after Robert's death, William had the tenement as Robert's nearest heir. Thus, William immediately after Robert's death, remained in seisin of the tenement as his nearest heir and was in peaceful seisin for three weeks, until Matilda came to the tenement on a certain day around the hour of nones. William ordered her to be removed by the bailiffs of the vill. That she was not disseised, on this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that William and the others have not disseised Matilda, since they say that William, after Robert's death, was in seisin of the tenement for three weeks and more as his nearest heir. Immediately [after] Matilda had placed herself in seisin of the tenement, she was removed by the bailiff of the vill. Thus, she was never in seisin as of a free tenement. So it is adjudged that William and the others are without a day. Matilda takes nothing by this assize and is in mercy for false claim. The amercement is pardoned because of her poverty.

B29. Nicholaus de la Dene in misericordia pro transgressione et finem fecit per *dimidiam marcam*²⁴ per plegium Hamonis de Sotemere et Radulfi de Alestede.

B29. Nicholas de la Dean [is] in mercy for a transgression. He made fine for a *half mark* by pledge of Hamo of Sotemere and Ralph of Alestead.

B30. Galfridus de Birestowe qui tulit breve de transgressione versus Hamonem de Bocland' et alios non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*.²⁵ Queruntur nomina plegios.

B30. Geoffrey of Bristow, who brought a writ of trespass against Hamo of Bocland and others named in the writ, has not prosecuted. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. The names of the pledges are to be examined into.

B31.(Surr') Johannes de Gatesden' ponit loco suo Robertum de la Hyde versus Gilbertum de Colevill' de placito assise mortis antecessoris etc.

B31.(Surrey) John de Gatesden appoints as his attorney Robert de la Hide against Gilbert of Colevill concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor.
[Cross-reference: B1, B32]

B32.(Surr', T.) Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus de Colevill' pater Gilberti de Colevill' fuit seisitus in dominico suo etc. de uno mesuagio, quaterviginti acris terre, duabus acris bosci, duabus acris prati, uno molendino et quinque marcatis redditus cum pertinenciis in Kersauton' die quo etc. Et si etc. Que Johannes de Gatesden' tenet. Qui venit. Et dicit quod non potest ei inde ad hoc breve respondere, quia dicit quod non tenet, predicta tenementa versus eum petita. Dicit enim quod quidam Johannes (de Welvesⁱ) ea tenet, et tenuit die quo breve istud perquisitum fuit versus eum. Et quod ita sit ponit se super patriam.

Et Gilbertus dicit quod exceptio ista non debet ei nocere, quia dicit quod de isto eodem

²⁴Margin note by scribe, di. m. crossed out.

²⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

tenemento inplacitavit ipse alias predictum Johannem de Gatesden' per breve nove disseisine coram H. le Bygod Justiciario Anglie hic ita quod idem Johannes ad breve illud respondit tanquam tenens de predictis tenementis, scilicet quodam die Jovis. Et dicit quod in crastino scilicet die veneris pronunciatum fuit iudicium per quod predicta tenementa remanserunt predicto Johanni. Dicit etiam quod predictus Johannes insuper tunc quesitus si ipse integre tenueret predicta tenementa nec ne; dixit quod sic et dicit quod ipso eodem die in continenti accessit ipse ad curiam Regis et perquisivit breve istud. Et quia hoc idem convictum est per datam brevis. Consideratum est quod exceptio illa ei locum non teneat. Et quod respondeat ulterius. Et Johannes dicit quod non debet ei inde ad hoc breve respondere, quia dicit quod alias per predictam assisam nove disseisine que capta fuit inter ipsum et predictum Gilbertum convictum fuit quod quidam Willelmus de Colevill' avus istius Gilberti post mortem predicti Willelmi de cuius morte etc. tenuit predictam terram nomine custodie cum predicto Gilberto circiter per septem annos vel amplius, unde desicut si ita esset et predictus Willelmus disseisitus esset de predictis tenementis per aliquem qui clamaret feodum vel liberum tenementum in eisdem competeret accione nove disseisine predicto Gilberto ad statum suum recuperandum quo ad liberum tenementum, petit iudicium si de antiquiori seisina aliquid clamare possit in predictis tenementis. ----- Et quia predictus Johannes non potest ostendere quod predictus Gilbertus unquam fuit in seisina de predictis tenementis postquam fuit plene etatis. Et etiam compertum est per recordum predictae assise nove disseisine quod predictus Johannes in capione eiusdem assise cognovit et obiecit eidem Gilberto quod ipse nunquam aliquam seisinam habuit de predictis tenementis, ita quod potuit inde disseisiri, consideratum est quod predicta exceptio non debet ei nocere quominus respondeatur ad breve istud. Et Johannes dicit quod non potest ei inde respondere, quia dicit quod non tenet integre predictam terram versus eum petitam. Dicit enim quod quidam Alanus Snoter tenet inde unam acram terre et dimidiam. Et preterea dicit quod de predicto redditu tenet ipse Johannes novem solidos in Hosle et desicut nullam mencionem sit in brevi isto de predicta villa de Horle, petit iudicium. ----- Et quia predictus Johannes prius proposuit predictam exceptionem de seisina predicti Gilberti que peremptoria est quo ad hoc breve, eo quod si admissa esset nunquam ad tale breve recuperaret, consideratum est quod ista exceptio que dilatoria est et minor illa eidem Johanni competere non debet modo proposita. Et Johhanes dicit quod predictus Gilbertus nichil clamare potest in predicta terra de morte predicti Willelmi quia dicit quod quidam Willelmus de Colevill' avus ipsius Gilberti habuit duos filios, scilicet predictum Willelmum de Colevill' patrem ipsius Gilberti antenatum et quendam Radulfum postnatum. Et dicit quod idem Willelmus avus feoffavit predictum Radulfum de quibusdam terris et tenementis in Braunton' -----in Comitatu Suff' que excedunt valorem predictae terre modo petite. Et dicit quod predictus Radulfus supervixit predictum Willelmum fratrem suum. Ita quod iste Gilbertus successit ei in predictis tenementis tamquam nepos ipsius Radulfi et heres propinquior. Dicit etiam quod predictus Radulfus per longum tempus ante mortem suam feoffavit ipsum Johannem de predicta terra modo petita, unde dicit quod si alius ipsum inplacitaret de predicta terra; predictus Gilbertus ei teneretur waranticare tamquam factum predicti Radulfi avunculi sui cuius heres ipse est. Et quesitus si quam cartam vel monumentum habeat de predicto feoffamento, dicit quod non, set dicit quod habuit inde quandam cartam de feoffamento quam quidam nuncius eius illam deferendo versus Wynton' amisit et offert domino rege C solidos per sic quod inquiratur. ----- Et Gilbertus bene defendit quod non teneretur ei waranticare, predictam terram si alius ipsum inplacitaret desicut predictus Johannes nullam cartam profert de feoffamento predicti Radulfi. Et preterea dicit quod licet aliquam cartam haberet de feoffamento non teneretur ei waranticare quia dicit quod ipse nullam terram vel tenementum habet qui ei descendit jure et hereditare de predicto Radulfo avunculo suo. Dicit enim quod revera predictus Willelmus avus suus aliquo tempore feoffavit predictum Radulfum de predictis terris et tenementis in Braunton' per cartam suam tenendis eidem Radulfo et heredibus suis de se exentibus tantum de predicto Willelmo et heredibus suis. Ita quod si idem Radulfus obiret sine herede de se predictae terre et tenementa reverterentur ad predictum Willelmum et heredes suos, et similiter confecit ei quandam cartam de feoffamento de predictis tenementis in Cressaulton', set nullam fecit ei (indeⁱ) seisinam et postmodo in processu temporis remisit predictus Radulfus et quietumclamavit predicto Willelmo predicta tenementa in Kersalton' per cartam suam quam profert de quietumclatione et que hoc testatur et de predictis terris et tenementis in Braunton' obiit

idem Radulfus seisis sine herede de se. Ita quod post mortem ipsius Radulfi intrevit quidam Petrus filius Osberti Capitalis dominus feodi illius in predictas terras et tenementa tamquam in eschagio predicti Gilberti ratione condicionis apposite in predicto feoffamento. Et profert quandam cartam per quam predictus Radulfus feoffatus fuit que modum predicti feoffamenti testatur. Et Johannes non potest hoc dedicere. Et quesitus si aliquod aliud sciat vel velit dicere contra assisam, dicit quod non nisi tantum quod dicit quod predictus Willelmus de cuius morte etc. per longum tempus ante mortem suam reddidit predicto Willelmo de Colevill' pater suo predicta tenementa in Kersaulton'. Ita quod non obiit inde seisis. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod Willelmus de Colevill' senior feoffavit Willelmus de Colevill' juniorem patrem predicti Radulfi de omnibus predictis tenementis in Kersaulton' cum pertinenciis. Et dicunt quod idem Willelmus obiit seisis de eisdem tenementis cum pertinenciis in dominico suo ut de feodo et post terminum et quod predictus Gilbertus propinquior heres suus est. Et questi si predictus Johannes integre teneat predictam terram vercionis eum petitam et similiter predictum redditum integre in predicta villa de Kersaulton', dicunt quod sic. Et ideo consideratum (est)²⁶ quod predictus Gilbertus recuperet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Johannes in *miser cordia*.²⁶

B32.(Surrey, T.) Was William of Colevill father of Gilbert of Colevill seized in demesne of one messuage, eighty acres of land, two acres of wood, two acres of meadow, one mill and five marks rent in Carshalton on the day? John de Gatesden holds the aforesaid. He comes and says that he is not able to answer to this writ, since he says that he does not hold the tenements claimed against him. In fact he says that John of Welwyn holds it and held it on the day the writ was obtained against him. On this he places himself on the country.

Gilberts says that this exception ought not to harm him, since concerning this same tenement he pleaded John de Gatesden, elsewhere, by writ of novel disseisin before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England, namely on Thursday. Thus, John should respond to this writ as a tenant of the tenements. He says that on the morrow, namely Friday, judgement was pronounced by which the tenements remained to John. He also says that John, concerning the above, was then asked if he fully held the aforesaid tenements or not. He said yes. He says that on the same day, he immediately entered the king's court and obtained this writ. Since the same is determined by the date of the writ, so it is adjudged that this exception does not hold. He shall answer further. John says that he ought not to answer to this writ, since elsewhere by the assize of novel disseisin which was taken between himself and Gilbert, it was determined that William of Colevill, Gilbert's grandfather, after the death of William whose death [this assize is arraigned for] held the land in the name of custody with Gilbert for nearly seven years and more, whereas even if this is so and William has been disseised of the tenements by someone who had claimed fee or free tenement in the same, there is available to Gilbert the action of novel disseisin to stand to recover his state as regards the tenement. He seeks judgement if from ancient seisin he can claim anything in the tenements. ----- Since, John is not able to show that Gilbert was ever in seisin of the tenements after he was of age, and also [since] it is determined by the record of the aforesaid assize of novel disseisin that John in taking the assize acknowledged and objected to Gilbert that he never had any seisin of the tenements so that he could be disseised, so it is adjudged that the aforesaid exception does not prevent him from answering this writ. John says that he is not able to answer to this writ since he does not hold all the land claimed against him. [He says] that Alan Snoter holds one and a half acres of land. Moreover, he says that, concerning the rent, he holds nine shillings in Horsley and whereas no mention of the vill Horsley is made in the writ, he seeks judgment.----- Since John previously proposed the aforesaid exception concerning Gilbert's seisin which is destructive as regards this writ, because if it is to be admitted as such he might never recover the writ, so it is adjudged that this exception, which is delaying and minor, ought not to be available to John in the manner proposed. John says that Gilbert is able to claim nothing in the land from William's death, since he says that William of Colevill, Gilbert's grandfather, had two sons, namely William of Colevill the first born, Gilbert's father, and Ralph the latter born. He says that William, the grandfather,

²⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

enfeoffed Ralph of a certain lands and tenements in Brampton ----- in the county of Suffolk which exceeded the value of the land now sought. He says that Ralph out-lived his brother William. Thus, Gilbert succeeded him in the tenements as Ralph's nephew and nearest heir. He says that a long time before his death, Ralph enfeoffed John of the land now sought. Wherefore, he says that if anyone pleaded him concerning the land, Gilbert is held to warrant him, as a deed of Ralph whose heir he is. Asked if he had a charter or artifact concerning the enfeoffment; he said he had none. But, he says that he thereafter had a charter of enfeoffment which a certain nunciate of his lost [while] bearing it to Winchester. He offers the king 100 shillings on condition that this be examined into. ----- Gilbert readily maintains that he is not held to warrant John for the land if anyone pleads him, since John has produced no charter of enfeoffment from Ralph. Moreover, he says that although John may have a charter of enfeoffment he is not held to warrant him since he holds no land or tenement which descends from his uncle Ralph to him by right or inheritance. In fact, he says that by his charter William, his grandfather, once enfeoffed Ralph of the lands and tenements in Brampton for Ralph and his heirs begat through him [or] from William only. Thus, if Ralph died without an heir the land and tenement would revert to William and his heirs. Likewise, he made a charter of enfeoffment concerning the tenements in Carshalton, but he made no seisin to him thereafter. In the course of time, Ralph remitted and quitclaimed the tenements in Carshalton to William by Ralph's charter of quitclaim, which he produced, and in which this is testified. Concerning the lands and tenements in Brampton, Ralph died seized [and] without an heir. Thus, after Ralph's death, a certain Peter son of Osbert, chief lord of that fee, entered the lands and tenements as Gilbert's escheat, by reason of the conditions in the aforesaid enfeoffment. He produced a charter in which this method by which Ralph was enfeoffed is testified to. John cannot deny this. Asked if [he had] any other information or wished to say anything against the assize, he said no, except only that he says that William for a long time before his death rendered the tenement in Carshalton to William of Colevill, his father. Thus he [the grandfather] did not die seized. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that William of Colevill senior enfeoffed William of Colevill junior, Gilbert's father, of all the tenements in Carshalton. They say that William died seized of the tenements in demesne as of fee after the term [contained in the writ] and that Gilbert is his nearest heir. [The jurors were] asked if John fully holds the land as he claims and likewise the rent in Carshalton. They say yes. So it is adjudged that Gilbert recovers his seisin. John [is] in *mercy*.

[Cross-references: B1, B31]

[Membrane 3]

B33.(Surr', vacat quia alibi) Editha de Podmor optulit se ⁱⁱⁱⁱ¹⁰ die versus Robertum de Staundon', Robertum filium Gervase, Robertum le Cruchere et Henricum de Dichtune de placito quare vi et armis venerunt ad domum ipsius Edithae in Podmor et eam a dicta domus sua eiecerunt, verberaverunt, vulneraverunt et maletractaverunt contra pacem etc. Et ipsi non venerunt et Robertus de Staundon' fuit attachiatus per Alanum de Valeford. Et Brunium de Valeford et Robertus filius Gervase per Willelmum de Fonte de Saundon' et Thomam de Fonte de eadem. Et Rogerus per Adam Rudlawe de Boveries et Ricardum de Overhalle de eadem. Et Henricus per Willelmum le Wyse de Valeford et Willelmum le Mun' de eadem. Ideo ponantur per meliores plegios quod sint in adventu H. le Bygot ad partes illas. Et (il) etc.

B33.(Surrey, cancelled) Edith of Podmor put in an appearance on the fourth day against Robert of Standen, Robert son of Gervase, Robert le Crucher and Henry of Ditton concerning a plea whereby they came with force of arms to Edith's house in Podmor and ejected her from her house [and] beat, wounded and maltreated her against the peace. They have not come. Robert of Standen was attached by Alan of Valeford and Browning of Valeford. Robert son of Gervase [was attached] by William of Fonte of Sanden and Thomas of Fonte from the same place. Roger [was attached] by Adam Rudlaw of Boveries and Richard of Overhill from the same place and Henry by William le Wise of Valeford and William le Miller from the same place. They are to be placed on better pledges that they shall be at the next coming of

[Hugh] Bigod to these parts. And () etc.

- B34.(Surr') Ass. ven rec. si Ricardus Aumfrey, Henricus de Appelderwe, Hugo de Appelderl', Johannes de Newenham, Johanes de Newenham, Johannes filius Willelmi Wykelot, Ricardus de Boycroft, Adrianus de Ledrede, Radulfus de Ledrede, Rogerus Derekam, Rogerus Norreys, Robertus le Mun', Willelmus le Cupere, Gilbertus Colpet, Robertus Colpet, Gilbertus Sweytricht et Willelmus le Blunt injuste etc. disseisiverunt Gilbertum filium Roberti de Michelham de libero tenemento suo in Ledred' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de duabus acris prati et dimidia. Et nullus eorum venerunt, preter predictum Ricardum Aumfrey. Post venit predictus Gilbertus et retraxit se de brevi suo. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in misericordia scilicet, Gilbertus de la Heke et Robertus del Boys. Postea convenit inter eos, scilicet quod predictus Ricardus Aumfrey reddidit predicto Gilberto filio Roberti predictum pratum cum pertinenciis tenendum eidem Gilberto et heredibus suis de capitale domino feodi illius per servicium que ad predictum pratum pertinent. Et preterea dat ei xl solidos quos ei soluet sine dilatione.
- B34.(Surrey) Did Richard Humfrey, Henry of Appledore, Hugh of Appledore, John of Newnham, John of Newnham, John son of William Wykelot, Richard of Boycroft, Adrian of Leatherhead, Ralph of Leatherhead, Roger Derekam, Roger Norreys, Robert le Miller, William le Cooper, Gilbert Colpet, Robert Colpet, Gilbert Sweytricht and William le Blund disseise Gilbert son of Robert of Mitcham of his free tenement in Leatherhead? He complains that they have disseised him of two and a half acres of meadow. None of them came, except Richard Humfrey. Afterwards, Gilbert came and withdrew his writ, so he and his pledges [are] in mercy, namely Gilbert de la Heath and Robert del Bosco. Afterwards, it [is] agreed between them namely that Richard Humfrey renders the meadow to Gilbert son of Robert for Gilbert and his heirs to hold of the chief lord of that fee by the service which pertains to the meadow. Moreover, Richard gave Gilbert 40 shillings which he shall pay to him without delay.
- B35.(Surr') Adam de la Bure qui tulit assisam mortis antecessoris versus Willelmus de Hadresham et Margeriam uxorem eius, Johannem Waps et Aliciam uxorem eius et Willelmus de la Bure de duobus mesuagiis quinquaginta quatuor acris terre quatuor acris prati tribus acris bosci quatuor solidis et quatuor denariis redditus cum pertinenciis in Nutfeud non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in misericordia, scilicet Nicholaus filius Willelmi et Nicholaus le Macun.
- B35.(Surrey) Adam de la Bure, who brought an assize of mort d' ancestor agansit William of Hathersham, Marjery his wife, John Wasp, Alice his wife and William de la Bure concerning two messuages, fifty-four acres of land, four acres of meadow, three acres of woods, four shillings and four pence rent in Nutfield, has not prosecuted his suit. So he and his pledes [are] in mercy, namely Nicholas son of William and Nicholas le Mason.
- B36. Aunfridus filius Roberti de Ewesham dat *dimidiam marcam*²⁷ pro licencia concordandi cum Willelmo filio Roberti de la Dene de placito assise mortis antecessoris per plegium predicti Willelmi. Et habeant cyrogrphum.
- B36. Humfrey son of Robert of Lewisham gives a *half mark* for a licence to agree with William son of Robert de la Dean concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by pledge of the aforesaid William. Let them have a chirograph.
- B37. Godefridus de Rokeshened', Willelmus de Schaldeford et Willelmus de Br[a]demere in misericordia pro transgressione. Et Godefridus finem fecit per *dimidiam marcam*²⁸ per plegium Petri le Templer. Et Willelmus de Schauford' finem fecit per *xx^{ti} solidos*²⁹ per

²⁷Margin note by scribe, di. m. crossed out.

²⁸Margin note by scribe, di. m. crossed out.

²⁹Margin note by scribe, xx. s. crossed out.

plegium Willelmi de Brademere. Et idem Willelmus de Brademere finem fecit per *xl solidos*³⁰ per plegium Rogeri le Gras et Ricardi de Hameledon.

B37. Godfrey of Rokeshewed, William of Shelford and William of Bradmore [are] in mercy for a transgression. Geoffrey makes fine for a *half mark* by pledge of Peter le Templer. William of Shelford makes fine for *20 shillings* by pledge of William of Bradmore. William of Bradmore makes fine for *40 shillings* by pledge of Roger le Gros and Richard of Hambledon.

B38.(A circle with a dot in the center) Ass. ven. rec. si Radulfus de Ecleshal' clericus injuste etc. disseisivit Johannem le Pestur de communa pasture sue in Hemstede que pertinet ad liberum tenementum suum in eadem villa, post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de *xii^{cim}* acris bruere ubi semper communicare solebat donec idem Radulfus ipsum injuste disseisivit. Et Radulfus non venit et fuit attachiatus per Ricardum le Bunt et Willelmum Arnald de Dorking. Ideo (ipsi^s) in misericordia. Et assisa capiatur versus eum per defaultam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Radulfus disseisivit predictum Johannem de communa pasture sue quam posuit in viso suo (injuste etc.¹) sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum [est] quod predictus Johannes recuperet seisinam suam per visum juratorum. Et Radulfus in *misericordia*.³¹ *Dampna. dimidia marca. Totum clericis.*

B38.[Surrey] (A circle with a dot in the center) Did Ralph of Eccleshall a clerk disseise John le Pestur of his common pasture which pertains to his free tenement in Hampstead? He complains that he has disseised him of 12 acres of heath where he was accustomed to common until Ralph disseised him. Ralph has not come. He was attached by Richard le Blund and William of Dorking. So he [is] in mercy. The assize is taken against him by default.

The jurors say that Ralph disseised John of his common pasture. So it is adjudged that John recovers his seisin. Ralph [is] in *mercy*. *Damages: a half mark, all to the clerks.*

B39. Ass. ven. rec. si Symon Passelewe, Radulfus de Waleshall', Willelmus de Northwode, Adam le Pestur, Willelmus le Porter, Willelmus le Sumenur de Merwe, Rogerus le Clerk et Adam de Munsted' injuste etc. disseisiverunt Thomam de Swynbrok' de libero tenemento suo in Merwe post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de uno mesuagio et xv acris terre cum pertinenciis. Et Symon et alii veniunt. Et Simon dicit quod predictus Thomas non potest disseisiri de aliquo libero tenemento, quia dicit quod villanus est [de] Galfrido de Cruce. Post venit predictus Thomas et retraxit se de brevi suo. Ideo predicti Symon et alii inde sine die. Et predictus Thomas et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*.³² Post venit predictus Simon et reddidit predicto Thome predicta tenementa. Et pro hac etc. predictus Thomas remisit ei dampna sua etc.

B39.[Surrey] Did Simon Passelewe, Ralph of Walsall, William of Northwood, Adam le Pestur, William le Porter, William le Summoner of Merrow, Roger le Clerk and Adam of Munstead disseise Thomas of Swinbrook of his free tenement in Merrow? He complains that they have dissiesed him of one messuage and 15 acres of land. Simon and the others come. Simon says that Thomas cannot be disseised of any free tenement, since he is a villein of Geoffrey de Cruce. Afterwards, Thomas comes and withdraws his writ. So Simon and the others are without a day. Thomas and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. Afterwards, Simon came and rendered the tenement to Thomas. For this, Thomas remitted his damages.

B40.(Surr',T) Ass. ven. rec. si Henricus Bannok' et Agatha uxor eius et Adam Grosse injuste etc. disseisiverunt Johannem Sauser de libero tenemento suo in Guldeford' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de uno mesuagio cum pertinenciis. Et Henricus et alii veniunt. Et nichil dicunt quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicunt quod predictus Johannes nunquam fuit inde in seisina. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et de hoc ponunt se

³⁰Margin note by scribe, xl. s. crossed out.

³¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictum mesuagium aliquo tempore fuit jus et hereditas cuiusdam Johannis le Sauser patris predicti Johannis et idem Johannes le Sauser tenetur quibusdam judeis in quodam debito (xxxvi solidis.¹) Et quia ipse non habuit denarios reddere potuit predictum debitum, tradidit ipse predictum mesuagium predicto Ade Grosse ad terminum trium annorum ad acquietandum ipsum Johannem de xx solidis versus predictos judeos. Et postea assignavit predictum mesuagium predicto Henrico Bannok' tenendum per alios tres annos pro residuo predicti debiti, scilicet pro xvi solidis quos ipse reddere debuit predictis judeis pro predicto Johanne. Et dicunt quod ille diem postea confecit quandam cartam de feoffamento predictae Agathe de predicto mesuagio que modo est in seisinam per feoffamentum predictum. Et dicunt quod predictus Johannes Sauser qui modo queritur se disseisiverunt nunquam inde aliquam seisinam habuit post mortem predicti Johannis patris sui, nec ante. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et ideo consideratum [est] quod predicti Henricus et alii inde sine die. Et Johannes nichil capiat per assisam istam. Et sit in *miser cordia*³³ pro falso clamore.

B40.(Surrey, T) Did Henry Bannok and Agatha his wife and Adam Gros disseise John Sauser of his free tenement in Guildford? He complains that they have disseised him of one messuage. Henry and the others come. They say nothing to stop the assize, except only that they say John was never in seisin so that he could be disseised. On this they place themselves on the assize.

The jurors say that the messuage was once the right and inheritance of John le Sauser, John's father, and John le Sauser is held in a debt to certain jews for 36 shillings. Since he did not have the money to render for the debt, he surrendered the messuage to Adam Gros for a three year term to acquit him of 20 shillings against the jews. Afterwards, he assigned the messuage to Henry Bannok to hold for another three years for the rest of the debt, namely 16 shillings which he ought to render to the jews for John. They say that on the same day he conferred a charter of enfeoffment concerning the messuage to Agatha, who is now in seisin. They say that John Sauser, who now complains they have dissiesed him, neither had seisin after his father's death nor before, so that he could be disseised. So it is adjudged that Henry and the others are without a day. John takes nothing by this assize and is in *mercy* for false claim.

B41.(Surr') Robertus de Hexsted' qui tulit assisam nove disseisine versus Simonem de Potinden' et alios in brevi de tenemento in Lingefeld' non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *miser cordia*,³⁴ scilicet Simo de la Forde et Radulfus de Hexsted'.

B41.(Surrey) Robert of Hexstead, who brought an assize of novel disseisin against Simon of Puttenden and others named in the writ concerning a tenement in Lingfield, has not prosecuted his suit. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely Simon de la Ford and Ralph of Hexstead.

B42.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Robertus de Brywes, Johannes de Brywes et alii injuste etc. disseisiverunt Adam de la Stampe de libero tenemento suo in Wysle, post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de decem et septem acris terre (et dimidia¹) cum pertinentiis. Post venit predictus Adam et retraxit se ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *miser cordia*.³⁵ Perdonatur per justiciarium. Post (con¹)venit inter eos quod predictus Adam remisit et quitumclamavit de se et heredibus suis predicto Roberto et heredibus suis totum jus et clameum quod habuit in predicta terra cum pertinentiis imperpetuum. Et pro hac etc. predictus Robertus dabit predicto Ade x marcas quas ei reddet in Crastino Clausi Pasche anno xliii. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

B42.(Surrey) Did Robert de Briwes, John de Briwes and others disseise Adam de la Stampe of his free tenement in Wisley? He complains that they have disseised him of seventeen and a

³³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³⁴Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

³⁵Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

half acres of land. Afterwards, Adam comes and withdraws his suit, so he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. He is pardoned by the justiciar. Afterwards, it [is] agreed between them that Adam remit and quitclaim himself and his heirs to Robert and his heirs all right and claim which he had in the land in perpetuity. For this, Robert gives Adam 10 marks, which he shall render to him on the morrow of the close of Easter year 43 [21 April 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

B43.(Surr') Walterus Doket qui tulit juratam xxiiii^{or} ad convicendum xii^{cim} versus Hubertum filium Jordani de uno mesuagio, quatuor acris terre et una roda terre cum pertinenciis in Chelesham non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de prosequendo in *misericordia*.³⁶ Non invenit plegios, quia per fidem.

B43.(Surrey) Walter Doget, who brought a jury of 24 to attain 12 against Hubert son of Jordan concerning one messuage, four acres of land and one rod of land in Chelsham, has not prosecuted his suit. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. He did not find pledges since he [is] faithless.

B44.(Surr') Willelmus filius Willelmi le Noble qui tulit assisam mortis antecessoris versus Henricus le Noble de duabus mesuagiis et duabus rodibus terre cum pertinenciis in Dorking' non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de prosequendo in *misericordia*,³⁷ scilicet Johannes de la Hern' de Wystumble et Willelmus del Soler.

B44.(Surrey) William son of William le Noble, who brought an assize of mort d' ancestor against Henry le Noble concerning two messuages and two rods of land in Dorking, has not prosecuted his suit. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely John de la Hern of Whitstaple and William del Soler.

[Membrane 3d.]

Adhuc apud Bermundes'

Still at Bermondsey.

B45.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus le Wudeward injuste etc. disseisivit Ricardum de Munsted' de libero tenemento suo in Becham post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de quadam pecia terre que continet xl^a perticate terre in longitudine, et quatuor pedes terre in latitudine. Et Willelmus venit. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat. Juratores dicunt quod predictus Willelmus disseisivit predictum Ricardum de predicto tenemento quod posuit in visu suo injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Ricardus recuperet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Willelmus in *misericordia*.³⁸ *Dampna: dimidia marca. Medietas clericis.*

B45.(Surrey) Did William le Woodward disseise Richard of Munstead of his free tenement in Beckenham? He complains that he has disseised him of a certain piece of land which contains land 40 perches in length and four feet in width. William comes and says nothing to stop the assize.

The jurors say that William disseised Richard. So it is adjudged that Richard recovers his seisin. William [is] in *mercy*. *Damages: a half mark, half to the clerks.*

B46.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus de la Strod' injuste etc. disseisivit Hugo del Molyn de communa pasture sue in Kingeston' que pertinet ad liberum tenementum suum in eadem villa post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de communa pasture sue in dimidia acra pasture in qua communicare solebat per totum annum cum omnimodis averiis suis

³⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³⁷Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

³⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

quousque predictus Willelmus eam includit fossato et haya quominus predictus Hugo ibidem communicare potest sicut solebat. Et Willelmus venit, et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit, quod predictus Hugo nunquam fuit inde in seisina. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Willelmus disseisivit predictum Hugonem de communia pasture sue in una roda terre de predicta placea. Dicunt enim quod idem Willelmus appropriavit sibi predictam rodam terre adjacentem mesuagio suo de solo domini Regis. Dicunt etiam quod predictus Willelmus non appropriavit sibi maius quam predictam rodam de predicta dimidia acra in qua predictus Hugo queritur se disseisivit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Hugo recuperet seisinam suam de communia pasture sue in predicta roda pasture per visum recognitorum. Et Willelmus in *misericordia*.³⁹ Et Hugo similiter in *misericordia*⁴⁰ pro falso clamore, quo ad residuum predictae dimidie acre etc. *Dampna. xii denarii.*

B46.(Surrey) Did William de la Strood disseise Hugh del Molyn of his common pasture which pertains to his free tenement in Kingston? He complains that he has disseised him of his common pasture in a half acre of land in which he was accustomed to common throughout the year with all his beasts, until William enclosed it with a ditch and hedge by which the less he is able to common as he was accustomed. William comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says Hugh was never in seisin so that he could be disseised. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that William disseised Hugh of his common pasture in one rod of land in the aforesaid place. In fact they say that William appropriated the rod of land adjacent to his messuage from the king's site. They also say that William did not appropriate to himself more than the rod from the half acre in which Hugh complains he was disseised. So it is adjudged that Hugh recovers seisin of his common pasture in the rod of pasture. William [is] in *mercy*. Hugh, likewise, [is] in *mercy* for false claim as regards the rest of the half acre. *Damages: 12 pence.*

B47.(Surr') Matilda uxor Willelmi Tud ponit loco suo ipsum Willelmum virum suum versus Petrum le Templer et alios in brevi de placito assise nove disseisine, unde [est] querens etc.

B47.(Surrey) Matilda the wife of William Tud appoints as her attorney her husband William against Peter le Templer and others named in the writ concerning a plea of novel disseisin, in which she [is] the plaintiff.

B48.(Surr') Ass. ven rec. si Rogerus de la Grave, Thomas frater eius et Willelmus le Grave injuste etc. disseisiverunt Willelmum Pycot de libero tenemento suo in Kingston' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de xx pedibus terre in longitudine et xv pedibus in latitudine. Et Rogerus et omnes alii preter Thomas de la Grave, qui non fuit attachiatus quia non fuit inventus, veniunt. Et nichil dicunt quare assisa remaneat nisi, tantum quod dicunt quod quidam Willelmus Pycot pater predicti Willelmi Pycot feoffavit quendam Willelmum de la Grave fratrem ipsius Rogeri de predicto tenemento, et post mortem ipsius Willelmi fratris predicti Rogeri intravit ipse Rogerus in predictum tenementum tamquam frater et heres propinquior absque aliqua seisina quam predictus Willelmus unquam inde habuit. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et quod ita sit ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Rogerus et alii disseisiverunt predictum Willelmum de predicto tenemento quod posuit in visu suo injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus recuperet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Rogerus et alii in *misericordia*.⁴¹ *Dampna. vi denarii Totum [clericis].*

B48.(Surrey) Did Roger de la Grave, Thomas his brother and William le Grave disseise William Picot of his free tenement in Kingston? He complains that they have disseied him of land 20

³⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴¹Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

feet in length and 25 feet in width. Roger and all the others come, except Thomas de la Grave who was not attached since he was not found. They say nothing to stop the assize, except only that they say that William Picot, William's father, enfeoffed William de la Grave, Roger's brother, of the tenement. After William's death, Roger entered the tenement as his brother and nearest heir without William ever having had any seisin so that he could be disseised. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that Roger and the others disseised William of the tenement. So it is adjudged that William recovers his seisin. Roger and the others [are] in *mercy*. *Damages: 6 pence, all* [to the clerks].

B49.(Surr', T) Galfridus de Cruce cognovit quod debet Johanni de Warennia Comite Surr' lxxi solidos, viii denarios. Et similiter Gerardus de Evinton' cognovit quod debet predicto Comite lxxvi solidos. iii denarios, obulum pro arreragio feodi sui ipsum contingente de predicto Comite Surr' de tempore quo fuerunt vicecomites eiusdem comitatus. Et unde predictus Galfridus reddet predictos lxxi solidos, vii denarios in festo sancti Hyllarii anno xliii apud Dorking, et predictus Gerardus predictos lxxvi solidos, iii denario, obulum in Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie proximo sequentibus. Et nisi fecerint concedunt quod vicecomes faciant de terris etc. Et in super Petrus de Templer et Walterus Balaam sunt plegios predicti Galfridi et concedunt quod nisi predictus Galfridus reddidit ad predictum terminum suum etc. quod vicecomes (il) faciat de terris eorum nisi terre ipsius Galfridi ad hoc sufficiant. Et Henricus de Certes' et Hugo de la More sunt plegios predicti Gerardi in eadem forma etc.

B49.(Surrey, T) Geoffrey de Cruce acknowledges that he owes John de Warenne, Earl of Surrey, 71 shillings [and] 8 pence. Likewise, Gerard of Evington acknowledges that he owes the earl 66 shillings, 3 pence and a half-penny for arrears to the earl of Surrey's fee, for the time when they were sheriffs of the said county. Geoffrey shall render the 71 shillings, 8 pence at Dorking on the feast of Saint Hillary year 43 [13 January 1259] and Gerard [shall render] the 66 shillings, 3 pence and half-penny in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February]. If they do not, they grant that the sheriff may levy the amount from their lands. Concerning the above, Peter le Templer and Walter Balam are Geoffrey's pledges. They grant that unless Geoffrey pays the [money] at the term, then the sheriff may make up the amount from their lands, unless Geoffrey's [land] suffices for this. Henry of Chertsey and Hugh de la More are Gerard's pledges in the same manner.

B50.(Surr',T) Ass. ven. rec. si Odo de la Hyde pater Johannis de la Hyde fuit seisitus in dominico suo etc. de quatuor acris terre cum pertinenciis in Wetedune die quo obiit. Et si etc. Quam terram Radulfus de Plukel' tenet. Et Radulfus non venit etc. Et fuit resummonitus. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eum per defaultam.

Juratores dicunt quod quidam Lucas de la Sale aliquo tempore tenuit predictam terram in feodo, et feoffavit inde predictum Odonem de la Hyde, patrem predicti Johannis, de predicta terra tenendam sibi et heredibus suis de predicto Luca et heredibus suis per homagium et (perⁱ) servicium sexdecim denariis per annum. Et dicunt quod postea feoffavit idem Lucas predictum Radulfum de Plukel' de homagio et servicio predicti Odonis de predicto tenemento. Dicunt etiam quod idem Odo toto tempore suo fuit intendens predicto Lucie de servicio predicto pro eodem tenemento. Et quod inde obiit seisitus ut de feodo, et post terminum, et quod predictus Johannes propinquior heres eius est. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Johannes recuperet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Radulfus in *misericordia*.⁴²

B50.(Surrey, T) Was Odo de la Hide father of John de la Hide seized in demesne of four acres of land in Wotton on the day? Ralph of Pluckley holds the land. He has not come. He was resummoned. So the assize is taken against him by default.

The jurors say that Luke de la Sale once held the land in fee. He enfeoffed Odo de la Hide of the land to hold himself and his heirs of Luke and his heirs for homage and for a service of sixteen pence per year. They say that later Luke enfeoffed Ralph of Pluckley of Odo's homage and service. They also say that Odo for his lifetime was attentive to Luke

⁴²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

concerning the service for the tenement. Thus he died seized as of fee and after the term. John is his nearest heir. So it is adjudged that John recovers his seisin. Ralph [is] in *mercy*. [Cross-reference: ? B9]

B51.(Surr') Robertus Crul qui tulit juratam xxiiii^{or} ad convicendum xii^{cim} versus Rogerum le Heye de tenemento in Chidingfeld' non est prosecutus. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *miser cordia*⁴³ scilicet Willelmus atte Knolle de Cranleg' et Petrus atte Knolle de eadem.

B51.(Surrey) Robert Crul, who brought a jury of 24 to attain 12 against Roger le Heye concerning a tenement in Chiddingfold, has not prosecuted his suit. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely William atte Knowle of Cranliegh and Peter atte Knowle from the same place.

B52.(Surr') Johannes le Moyne qui tulit juratam xxiiii^{or} ad convicendum xii^{cim} versus Adam de Basing' de duodecim marcatis redditus cum pertinenciis in Benchesham et Croyndon venit et retraxit se. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de prosquendo in *miser cordia* finem fecit pro se et plegiis suis per *dimidiam marcam*.⁴⁴ Postea Convenit inter predictos Johannes et Adam quod predictus Adam remisit eidem Johannem centum solidos qui eidem Adam adjudicater (fueruntⁱ) per assisam nove disseisine nuper captam coram H. le Bigot de predicto redditu, et similiter remisit ei omnia arreragia eiusdem redditus, usque ad Natale domini anno xliii. Et pro hac etc. Idem Johannes concessit pro se et heredibus suis quod ipsi (deceteroⁱ) singulis annis a predicto festo Natalis Domini (^e) reddent prefato Ade et Johanne uxore eius et heredibus ipsius Ade duodecim marcas (argentiⁱ) de tenemento suo quod tenet in predictis villis de dono Hugone Chacepork' ad duos terminos scilicet medietatem ad predictum festum Natale domini anno xliii et alteram medietatem ad Nativitatem sancti Johanni Baptiste etc. Et nisi fecerit, concedit pro se et heredibus suis quod vicecomiti distringat eos etc.

B52.(Surrey) John le Monk, who brought a jury of 24 to attain 12 against Adam of Basing concerning twelve marks rent in Bensham and Croydon, comes and withdraws himself. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. He made fine for himself and his pledges at a *half mark*. Afterwards, it [is] agreed between John and Adam that Adam remit to John the one hundred shillings which were adjudicated to Adam by the assize of novel disseisin, recently taken before [Hugh] Bigod, concerning the rent. Likewise, he remitted all arrears in the rent up to the Nativity of the Lord year 43 [25 December 1258]. For this, John grants for himself and his heirs that henceforward each year at the feast of the Nativity of the Lord they shall render to Adam, Joan his wife and Adam's heirs twelve silver marks from the tenement which he holds in the aforesaid villis from the gift of Hugh Chaceporc, namely at two terms half at the feast of the Nativity of the Lord year 43 and the other half at the Nativity of Saint John the Baptist [24 June]. If he does not, he grants for himself and his heirs that the sheriff may distrain them. [Cross-reference: B15]

53.(Surr', T) Priorissa sancte Elene Lond' per attornatum suum queritur quod cum Godefridus de Norton' teneatur eidem Priorisse et successoribus suis in duabus marcis argenti annui redditus pro una domo quam tenet de tenemento ipsius Priorisse in Suwerk'. Ita quod si idem Godefridus deficeret in solucione predicti annui redditus ad terminos inter eos statutos, scilicet de dimidia marca ad festum sancti Michaelis, de dimidia marca ad Natale domini, de dimidia marca ad Pascham, de dimidia marca ad Nativitatem sancti Johanni Baptiste, bene liceret eidem Priorisse et attornatis suis ingredi predictum domum et illam tenere absque aliquo clamio ipsius Godfredi vel heredibus suorum imperpetuum. Idem Godfridus iam per unum annum detinuit eidem Priorisse predictum annum redditum, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl solidorum et inde producit sectam. Et profert cartam ipsius Godfredi quod hoc testatur.

Et Godefridus venit et bene cognovit predictam cartam et quod tenetur eidem Priorisse in

⁴³Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁴⁴Margin note by scribe, di. m. crossed out.

predicto annuo reddito, et non potest dedicere quin eidem Priorisse detinuit predictum annum redditum iam per unum annum. Et quare in predicta carta ipsius Godefridus continentur quod bene licet eidem Priorisse et successoribus suis ingredi ----- predictum domum et eam imperpetuum tenere absque aliquo clamio ipsius Godfridi vel heredibus suorum, consideratum est quod predicta Priorissa recuperet seisinam suam de predicta domo prout in predicta carta continetur. Et Godefridus in *misericordia*.⁴⁵

B53.(Surrey, T) The Prioress of Saint Hellens London, through her attorney, complains that whereas Godfrey of Norton is held to the prioress and her successors in two silver marks yearly rent for one house which he holds of the prioress' tenement in Southwark, so that if Godfrey fails to pay the yearly rent, at the terms stated between them, namely a half mark at the feast of Saint Michael [29 September], a half mark at the Nativity of the Lord [25 December], a half mark at Easter [and] a half mark at the Nativity of Saint John the Baptist [24 June], she and her attorneys are permitted to enter the house and hold it without claim from Godfrey or his heirs in perpetuity. Godfrey, for a year now, has withheld the yearly rent from the prioress. Wherefore, she says that she has suffered damage to the value of 40 shillings. Thereon she produces suit. She produced Geoffrey's charter in which this is testified.

Godfrey comes and readily acknowledges the charter and that he is held to the prioress in the yearly rent. He is not able to deny that he withheld the rent for a year now. Wherefore, [since] it is contained in Godfrey's charter that the prioress and her successors are permitted to enter ----- the house and hold it in perpetuity without any claim by Godfrey or his heirs, so it is adjudged that the prioress recovers her seisin of the house, as is contained in the charter. Godfrey [is] in *mercy*.

[Membrane 4]

Hundredum de Wodeton'

The Hundred of Wotton

B54.(T) Juratores presentaverunt coram quatuor militibus ad inquisitiones faciendas assignatis, quod Gerardus de Eventon' dum fuit vicecomes, fecit Henricum Wyke latronem qui in pleno comitatu devenit probator, (viⁱ) appellare Thomam Bredgrom, Godfridum de la Hide et Willelmum de la Dene et cepit de eisdem i marcam et Henricus constabularius eius de Gildeford cepit de eisdem iii solidos. Dicunt etiam quod idem Gerardus cepit de Roberto de Weston' indictato, triginta solidos quod possit habere pacem. Et quod idem Gerardus fecit predictum probatorem, vi appellare Gilbertum Rumbald' et cepit ad eo viginti solidos quod possit esse sub plevina. Et Henricus Constabularius cepit de eodem tres solidos. Et Radulfus Gayolarius cepit de eodem xxvi denarios. Et quod idem Gerardus cepit de Willelmo le Saltere indictato de latrocinio dimidiam marcam et unam vaccam pretii quinque solidorum. Et Henricus Constabularius unam vaccam pretii quatuor solidorum.

Et Gerardus venit et bene cognovit quod cepit de predictis Thomas Bredgrom et aliis predictam marcam, quia dicit quod Senescallus Radulfus de Camoys optulit ei predictam marcam pro predicto Thome et aliis, per sic quod possunt esse in libero (cartere^s). Set quod nunquam fecit predictum probatorem ipsos (nec predictum Gilbertum Rumbald'ⁱ) vi appellare, ponit se super patriam. Et de Robert de Weston', dicit quod revera idem Robertus fuit indictatus coram eo ad turnum suum et amici eiusdem Robertum fecerunt predictum finem cum eo pro eo quod possint ipsum replegiare usque adventum justiciarii, set nichil adhuc recepit de eisdem triginta solidis. Et Robertus presens est, et bene cognovit quod adhuc ei nichil pacavit. Ideo Gerardus quantum ad hoc sine die. Et de viginti solidis captis de Gilberto Rumbald' et de aliis captionibus captis de Willelmo le Saltere, dicit quod cepit easdem captiones de eisdem pro dimittendo eos per plegium usque adventum justiciarii et ita capere consueverunt omnes vicecomites de predicto comitatu. Et xii^{cim} juratores ad hoc electi, dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Gerardus non fecit ipsum appellatorem

⁴⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

vi appellare precitos Thomam, Godfridum, Willelmum et Gilbertum Rumbald', immo idem appellator absque alicuius abetto appellavit eos. Ideo (predictus Gerardus⁴⁶) quantum ad hoc eat quietus. Et de captionibus predictis, dicunt quod revera idem Gerardus cepit predictam *marcam*⁴⁶ et frater suus Henricus predictos *tres solidos*⁴⁷ de predictis Thome et aliis. Et quod cepit (de⁴⁸) predicto Gilberto Rumbald *viginti solidos*⁴⁸ et Henricus frater suus *tres solidos*⁴⁹ et Gaiolarius *xxvi denarios*⁵⁰ pro dimittendo eos per plegium usque adventum justiciarii. Et quia non pertinet ad vicecomitem aliquid capere appellato pro eo dimittendo per plegium consideratum est quod injuste ceperunt predictos denarios et respondeant domino regi de eisdem, eo quod nullus sequitur pro eisdem et sint in *misericordia*⁵¹ pro transgressione. Et de aliis captionibus de Willelmo Saltere dicunt quod ceperunt easdem captiones pro ipso dimittendo per plegium usque adventum justiciarii ideo quantum ad hoc eant quieti.

B54.(T) The jurors have presented before the four knights assigned to make inquiries that Gerard of Evington, while he was sheriff, made Henry Wike, a thief who in full county [court] became an approver, forcibly appeal Thomas Bredgrom, Geoffrey de le Hide and William de la Dean, and he took 1 mark from them. Henry his constable of Guildford took 3 shillings from them. They also say that Gerard took thirty shillings from Robert of Weston an inditee so that he could have the peace. Gerard forcefully made the approver accuse Gilbert Rumbald and took twenty shillings from him so that he could be under bail. Henry the constable took three shillings from him. Ralph the gaoler took 26 pence from him. Gerard took a half mark and one cow, worth five shillings, from William le Saltere, indicted of theft. Henry his constable [took] one cow worth four shillings.

Gerard comes and readily acknowledges that he took the aforesaid mark from Thomas Bredgrom and the others, since he says that Ralph of Camoys' seneschal offered him the mark for Thomas and the others on condition that they be freed. But, [he says] he never made the approver forcefully appeal Gilbert Rumbald. On this he places himself on the country. Concerning Robert of Weston, he says that Robert was indicted before him at his tourn and Robert's friends made the fine with him on Robert's behalf, so that they could bail him until the next coming of the justiciar. But, [he says] he still has not received the thirty shillings from them. Robert is present and he readily acknowledges that he still has not paid him. So Gerard as to this is without a day. Concerning the twenty shillings taken from Gilbert Rumbald and concerning the other things seized from William le Saltere, he says that he took these things to release them on bail until the coming of the justiciar. [He says] all the sheriffs of the aforesaid county were accustomed to seize in this way. Twelve jurors elected by both parties say upon their oath that Gerard did not forcefully make the approver appeal Thomas, Geoffrey, William and Gilbert Rumbald, rather the approver without any instigation appealed them. So Gerard for this is quit. Concerning the seizures, they say that Gerard took the *mark* and his brother Henry [took] *three shillings* from Thomas and the others. Gerard took *twenty shillings* from Gilbert Rumbald and Henry took *three shillings* and the gaoler *26 pence* [in order] to release them on bail until the next coming of the justiciar. Since no seizure of this kind, to release an appellee on bail, pertains to the sheriff, so it is adjudged that they unjustly took the money. They shall answer to the king for the same, because no one sued for the same. They are in *mercy* for the transgression. Concerning the other seizures from William le Saltere they say that they took the seizures to release him on bail until the next coming of the justiciar, so on this they are quit.

B55.(T) Iidem presentaverunt quod idem Gerardus quando primo fuit vicecomes fecit turnum suum in Hundredo de Wodeton' ubi nullum tenuisse deberet, quia Galfridus de Cruce vicecomes ante ipsum, antea fecit turnum. Et predicti Gerardus et Galfridus veniunt et

⁴⁶Margin note by scribe, i. m. crossed out.

⁴⁷Margin note by scribe, iii. s. crossed out.

⁴⁸Margin note by scribe, xx. s. crossed out.

⁴⁹Margin note by scribe, iii. s. crossed out.

⁵⁰Margin note by scribe, xxvi. d. crossed out.

⁵¹Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

Gerardus bene cognoscit quod fecerit predictum turnum post Pascham in primo adventu suo, et Galfridus bene cognoscit quod ipse ante Pascham fecerat predictum turnum. Ideo ambo in *misericordia*.⁵²

B55.(T) The same have presented that Gerard, when he was first sheriff, made his tourn in the hundred of Wotton when none ought to be held, since Geoffrey de Cruce, the sheriff before him, had already made his tourn. Gerard and Geoffrey come. Gerard readily acknowledges that upon his first arrival he made a tourn after Easter. Geoffrey readily acknowledges that he made a tourn before Easter. So they are both in *mercy*.

B56.(T) Iidem presentaverunt quod Johannes de Gatesden', dum fuit vicecomes, fecit turnum suum bis in anno, ubi nullus vicecomes ante ipsum consuevit facere nisi unum turnum in anno. Ita quod de quolibet homine veniente ad turnos illos cepit per annum duos denarios, ubi prius nisi unum denarium dare consueverunt. Et Johannes de Gatesden' venit et bene cognoscit quod levare fecit predictum turnum; set dicit quod hoc fuit precepto domini regis set nullum inde ostendit warantum. Ideo in *misericordia*.⁵³ Et loquendum cum domino rege utrum velit illud turnum ulterius remanere vel non. Et si denarios bis debeant pacari vel non. Et villate de Boclaund' queritur quod levavit super eam iiii^{or} solidos pro eodem turno quos adhuc solvunt. Et totius Hundredum de *Reygat'* similiter queritur de eo.

B56.(T) The same have presented that John de Gatesden while he was sheriff made his tourn twice in one year, whereas no sheriff before him was accustomed to make more than one tourn per year. Thus, from each man coming to the tourns he took two pence per year, whereas previously they were accustomed to give but one. John de Gatesden comes and readily acknowledges that he made the tourn, but he says that this was at the king's order, but he showed no warrant. So he [is] in *mercy*. *It is to be discussed with the king* whether he wishes this tourn to be continued or not, and furthermore if the money ought to be paid twice or not. The vill of Bocland complains that he raised four shillings from them, which they still pay. The whole hundred of *Reigate* likewise complains of him.

B57. Presentaverunt etiam quod Galfridus de Cruce, dum fuit vicecomes, injuste cepit de hominibus Priorisse de Kuleburn' de Middleton' decem solidos pro evasione cuiusdem extranei. Et Galfridus venit et non potest hoc dedicere. Ideo in *misericordia*.⁵⁴ pro transgressione. Et respondeat domino regi de *decem solidos*.⁵⁵

B57. They have also presented that Geoffrey de Cruce, while he was sheriff, unjustly took ten shillings from the Prioress of Kilburn's men from Milton Regis for allowing a stranger to escape. Geoffrey comes and he is not able to deny this. So he [is] in *mercy* for the transgression. He shall answer to the king for the *ten shillings*.

B58. Johannes le Waleys de Okkelegh' queritur quod Alanus Snoter ballivus quod injuste cepit ab eo dimidiam marcam pro defalta quam fecisse debuit ad Comitatum Surr' ad quem comitatum nullam sectam debet etc.

Et Alanus (nonⁱ) venit . Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod habet corpus eius *crastino*. Post venit idem Alanus et dicit quod revera idem Johannes amerciatus fuit ad dimidiam marcam coram W. le Breton' justiciario assignato in quadam assisa nove dissesine eo quod idem Johannes fuit jurator eiusdem assise et non venit. Et Johannes non potest hoc dedicere. Ideo Alanus inde sine die. Et Johannes in *misericordia*.⁵⁶ pro falso clamore.

B58. John le Waleys of Ockley complains that Alan Snoter a bailiff unjustly took a half mark

⁵²Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁵³Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁵⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵⁵Margin note by scribe, x. sol. crossed out.

⁵⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

from him for a default which he made to the county [court] of Surrey to which [court] he owes no suit.

Alan has not come. So the sheriff is ordered that he have his body on the *morrow*. Afterwards, Alan comes and says that in fact John was amerced for a half mark because John was a juror and did not come before [William] le Breton, justice assigned to an assize of novel disseisin. John cannot deny this. So Alan is without a day. John [is] in *mercy* for false claim.

- B59. Iidem juratores (cum toto comitatuⁱ) presentaverunt quod Comitatus Surr' tenetur apud Gildeford' qui semper solebat teneri apud Leddrede et hoc est ad maximum dampnum totus comitatus. Ideo *loquendum cum domino Rege*.
- B59. The same jurors, along with the whole county, have presented that the county [court] of Surrey is held at Guildford, which [court] was always accustomed to be held at Leatherhead and this [move] is to the great damage of the whole county. So *it is to be discussed with the king*.
[Cross-reference: B75]
- B60. Johannes de Fissefold' queritur quod Rogerum pistor et Rogerum Vigers servientes persone ecclesie de Wodeton' ipsum injuste verberaverunt, vulneraverunt et maletractaverunt contra pacem etc. Et ipsi non venerunt. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat eos quod sint crastino. Postea testatum est quod non sunt inventi in comitatu. Et predictus Johannes non sequitur versus eos etc.
- B60. John of Fishfold complains that Roger baker and Roger Vigers serjeants of the parson of the Church of Wotton beat, wounded and maltreated him against the peace. They have not come. So the sheriff is ordered to distrain them to be [here] on the morrow. Afterwards, it is testified that they cannot be found in the county. John does not sue them.
- B61. Dicunt etiam quod Robertus le Trehur, Bartholomeus le Parker, Alanus Fairchild', Johannes le Baretur in Gildeford' et Magister Johannes le Mason in Kingeston' vendunt vinum contra assisam. Ideo omnibus in *misericordia*.⁵⁷
- B61. They also say that Robert le Trehur, Bartholomew le Parker, Alan Fairchild, John le Baretur in Guildford and Master John le Mazun in Kingston sold wine against the assize. They are all in *mercy*.
- B62. Convictum est per juratam inter Willelmum de Norwode querentem et Thomam de Swynebrok' clericum vicecomitis de verberacione, quod idem Thomas ipsum verberavit apud Gildeford'. Ideo in *misericordia*⁵⁸ pro transgressione et satisfaciat predicto Willelmo de predicta transgressione.
- B62. It is determined by the jury between William of Northwood, the plaintiff, and Thomas of Swinbrook, the sheriff's clerk, [in a plea] concerning a beating that Thomas beat him at Guildford. So he [is] in *mercy* for the transgression. He shall satisfy William of the transgression.
- B63.(T) Iidem juratores presentaverunt quod omnes vicecomites istius comitatus quando vendiderunt averia hominum existentum in misericordia domini regis pro amerciamentis, vendiderunt predicta averia pro voluntate sua, et non ad dimidiam valorem eorundem averiorum et eadem averia retinent ad opus ipsorum vel aliorum amicorum suorum. Ideo *loquendum*.
- B63.(T) The same jurors have presented that all the sheriffs of this county, when they sold beasts

⁵⁷Margin note by scribe, .b. and mie crossed out.

⁵⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

of those who men were in the king's mercy, sold the beasts at their own will and not for half their value and they retained the beasts to their benefit or that of their friends. So *it is to be discussed*.

B64. Convictum est per juratam inter predictum Willelmum de Norwode querentem et predictum Thomam de Swynebrok' de aspertacione vestatura dimidia acra prati in Wogging' et Seyne quod [leaves off abruptly]

B64. It is determined by the jury between William of Northwood, the plaintiff, and Thomas of Swinbrook concerning the removal of a crop from a half acre of meadow in Woking and Seyne, that

B65. Preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat Radulfum de Eccleshall' quod veniat responsurus Willelmo Stamer de hoc quod injuste cepit ab ipso dimidiam marcam in foro de Dorking'.

B65. The sheriff is ordered that he distrain Ralph of Eccleshall to come to answer William Stamer concerning this, that he unjustly took a half mark from him at Dorking market.

B66. Robertus de la Knolle in *misericordia*⁵⁹ pro contemptu curie.

B66. Robert de la Knowle [is] in *mercy* for contempt of court.

[Membrane 4d.]

Adhuc De Hundredo De Wodeton'

Still Concerning the Hundred of Wotton.

B67.(Essex', Kant', Surr') Juliana que fuit uxor Radulfi Hardel queritur de Johanne le Moyne quod predictus Johannes die Martis proxima post festum sancti Laurencii anno xlii simul cum pluribus aliis quos ipsa ignorat venerunt ad terram ipsius Julianne in Haschebrok' in Comitatu Essex' et ibidem ceperunt xii Boves, xiiii vaccas et x equos et ea fugavit usque Gravesende in Comitatu Kant' et ea ibi detinivit et adhuc detinet contra legem et consuetudinem regni et contra pacem etc. unde dicit quod deteriorata est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl librarum. Et unde producit sectam.

Et Johannes venit et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et quicquid est contra pacem etc. Et bene deffendit quod non cepit predicta averia nec ea fugare fecit de Comitatu Essex' in Comitatu Kant' sicut ei imponit. Set dicit quod vult cognoscere quandam veritatem. Et dicit quod Radulfus Hardel quondam vir ipsius Julianne tenebatur ei in centum marcis de quibus perpacari debuit longo tempore transacto. Et obligavit se per scriptum suum quod si non solueret ei predictam pecuniam (terminis statutisⁱ) quod non liceret executoribus predicti Radulfi si de eo humanitus contingeret executionem testamenti sui facere, quousque predicta pecunia plene esset ei persoluta, unde dicit quod post mortem predicti Radulfi accessit ad quendam Walterum Dragon senescallum Willelmi de Monte Kanis' de Swanecampe de cuius feodo predicta terra de Hassebrok' est et ostendit ei obligationem suam. Ita quod predictus senescallus misit quosdam servientes domini sui ad predictam terram et capere fecit predicta averia que fuerunt predicti Radulfi Hardel pro predicto debito. Et quod ita sit ponit se super patriam.

Et Julianna dicit quod predictus Johannes in propria persina sua (simul cum pluribus aliisⁱ) (venit^s) ad predictam terram suam in Hassebrok' et ibidem cepit predicta averia sicut predictum est. Et quod ita sit petit quod inquiretur per patriam. Et (Julianna^s) similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti *Essex'* quod venire faciat coram H. le Bygot in proximo adventu suo xii etc. per quos etc. Et qui nec etc. ad recognoscendum etc. in forma predicta.

B67.(Essex, Kent, Surrey) Juliana who was the wife of Ralph Hardel complains against John le

⁵⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Monk that he, on the next Tuesday following the feast of Saint Laurence year 42 [13 August 1258], along with many others of whom she is ignorant, came to her land in Hassenbrook in the county of Essex and there they seized 12 oxen, 14 cows and 10 horses and drove them to Gravesend in the county of Kent. They detained them there. They still detain them against the law and custom of the realm and against the peace. Wherefore, she says that she has suffered damage to the value of 40 pounds. Thereon she produces suit.

John comes and denys force and injury and whatever is against the peace. He readily maintains that he did not seize the beasts, nor drive them from Essex to Kent, as she alleges. But, he says that he wishes to know the truth. He says Ralph Hardel, once Juliana's husband, was held to him for one hundred marks, which he ought to have paid a long time ago. [Ralph] bound himself by his deed that if he did not pay the money to John at the stated terms then Ralph's executors could not lawfully, if Ralph died, carry out his will, until the money was paid to John in full. He says that after Ralph's death, he approached Walter Drew, seneschal of William of Montechensey of Swanscombe, to whose fee the land in Hassenbrook belonged. He showed him Ralph's deed. Thus, the seneschal sent certain serjeants to the land to seize Ralph's beasts for the debt. On this he places himself on the country.

Juliana says that John in person along with many others came to her land in Hassenbrook and there seized the beasts, as is stated. Thus, she request that this be examined into by the country. [John does] likewise. So the sheriff of *Essex* is ordered to make come before [Hugh] Bigod in his next coming 12 [knights] through whom [the truth might be known] and who neither etc. to declare in the aforesaid form.

Hundredum De Reygate

The Hundred of Reigate.

B68. Juratores presentant quod quidam homines Comitis Glouc' ex precepto Johannis de Staingreve senescalli eiusdem Comitis ceperunt xxii averia Dyonisie de Monte Kains' ad curiam ipsius Dyonisie de Notfeud in prima septimana Quadragissime anno xlii et illa chaciaverunt ad curiam de Blechingelegh' super aliam Baroniam et ea detinverunt usque Hokeday contra vadium et plegium per quod dicta domina interim amisit Wayneriam suam. Post venit Johannes de Scalar' et invenit hos plegios de proseguendo scilicet Nicholaum de Chylemede et Ricardum de Hadresham. Et queritur quod Willelmus le Waleys de Blechingelegh' et Radulfus Tytel ex precepto eius hoc fecerunt, scilicet quod ceperunt viii¹⁰ vaccas, viii¹⁰ Boves et septem juvenas super feodo Bonon' qui non est de feodo predicti comitatis. Et Johannes venit et dicit quod hoc non fecit. Et de ponit se super patriam. Juratores dicunt quod predicti Willelmus et Reginaldus ceperunt ex precepto dicti Johannis predicta averia in curia predictae domine extra feodum dicti comitis et ipsa detinuerunt per predictum tempus ad dampnum dicte domine quinque marcas eo quod terra sua fuit inculta. Ideo recuperet dampna sua et Johannes in *misericordia*⁶⁰ plegii de dampno et de misericordia Phillipus de Garston' et Rogerus de Loges.

B68. The jurors present that certain of the earl of Gloucester's men, by order of John of Stangrove the earl's seneschal, seized 22 of Denise of Montechensey's beasts from her court of Nutfield, during the first week of Lent year 42 [10-16 February 1258]. They drove them to the court of another baron from Blechingley and [there] they detained them until Hokeday [2 April] against the pledge, by which [act] said Denise meanwhile lost her means of cultivation. Afterwards, John of Scalers came and found these pledges for prosecuting, namely Nicholas of Chilmead and Richard of Hatcham. He complains that William le Waleys of Blechingley and Ralph Tytel, on John's order, carried out the following: they have seized 8 cows, 8 oxen and seven calves from the fee of Boulogne which is not a fee of the aforesaid county. John comes and says he did not do this. He places himself on the said earl. The jurors say that William and Ralph, on John's order, seized Denise's beasts from the lady's court outside the fee of the earl and they withheld them from her for the aforesaid period of time to the lady's loss of five marks, because her land was untilled. So she recovers her damages. John [is] in

⁶⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

mercy. The pledges for the damage and the amercement [are] Philip of Garston and Roger of Loges.

[Cross-reference: B73]

B69. Dicunt etiam quod Gerardus de Evinton' cepit de Henrico de Hale et Ricardo de Molendino inprisonatis per judicatumatum duas marcas et dimidiam ante quam voluit eos deliberare per plevinam usque adventum justiciarii. Et quia testatum est quod predicti Henricus et Ricardus capti fuerunt pro receptamento cuiusdam utlagati ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod habeat corpora eorum hic *die Lune*. Postea venerunt et recesserunt quieti per patriam.

B69. They also say that Gerard of Evington took two and a half marks from Henry of Hale and Richard of Mill, imprisoned by verdict [of the court], before he allowed them free on bail until the coming of the justiciar. Since it is testified that Henry and Richard were arrested for harbouring an outlaw, so the sheriff is ordered that he have their bodies here on *Monday*. Afterwards, they came and were acquitted by the country.

B70. Dicunt etiam quod Alicia Damaroyn dimisit manerium de Chepste de Willelmo de Ebor' ad firmam et ballivus eiusdem Willelmi tunc temporis (qui obiit¹) ceperit a quibusdam venientibus ad Nundinas de Chepsted' ad festum sancte Margarete teolonium et a quibusdam non. Et post terminum illum devenit predictum manerium in manu Comitis de Glouc'. Et Johannes de Staingreve ballivus eiusdem Comitis tunc plene cepit ibi theolonium ab omnibus ibi ementibus (vel¹) vendentibus. Et Johannes venit et dicit quod revera cepit dictum theolonium set dicit quod non cepit alio immo quam Walterus de Alnewyk' hoc cepit qui fuit ballivus ante ipsum. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam. Juratores dicunt quod tempore quo dictum manerium fuit in manu Odonis damaroyn et dicte Alicie nullum captum fuit ibi teolonium nisi tantum quod ballivi domini Regis ceperunt ibi emendas panis et cervisie. Et quando predictum manerium devenit ad Willelmum de Ebor' qui illud tenuit ad firmam quidam Walterus de Stekes ballivus suus qui obiit cepit ibi teolonium a quibusdam et similiter emendas panis et cervisie. Ita quod dominus Rex modo nichil habet, set dicunt quod dictus Johannes de Staingreve plene cepit teolonium ab omnibus ibi vendentibus vel ementibus. Ideo loquendum inde.

B70. They also say that Alice Damaroy demised the manor of Chipstead to William of York at farm. William's bailiff, who died, collected a toll from those coming to the fair of Chipstead at the feast of Saint Margeret and from others he [did] not. After the term, the manor returned to the earl of Gloucester's hand. John of Stangrove, the earl's bailiff, then fully collected the toll from all who bought and sold there. John comes and says that he took the toll, but not any other rather [only] that which Walter of Alnwick took, who was the bailiff before him. On this he places himself on the country. The jurors say that from the time the manor existed there was no toll, except only that which the king's bailiffs' collected for amends [to the assize of] bread and ale. When the manor returned to William of York, who held it at farm, his bailiff a certain Walter of Stokes, who died, collected a toll from each [person] there and likewise for amends [to the assize of] bread and ale. Thus, the king has nothing. But, they say that John of Stangrove fully collected the toll from all who bought and sold there. So *it is to be discussed*.

B71. Dicunt etiam quod Thomam le Pendere Ballivus Archiepiscopi Cantuar' de Grendon' non permitat homines de Cherledon' et Mersham venire ad summonicionem vicecomitis sine domini Regis set ipsos ameriat si venient. Et vicecomes similiter ipsos ameriat nisi vellent venire. Ideo veniat predictus Thomas *die Lune*.

B71. They also say that Thomas le Pendere, bailiff of the archbishop of Canterbury from Grendon', did not allow the men from Chilberton and Merstham to come to the sheriff's summons without the king's [order], but Thomas amerced them if they went. Likewise, the sheriff amerced them if they did not come. So Thomas shall come on *Monday*.

B72. Johannes de Sclar' senescallus Dyonisie de Mante Kanis' queritur pro domina sua de

Magistero Galfrido de Fering' et Symone de Wodeham [leaves off abruptly]

B72. John of Scalers, seneschal of Denise of Montechensey, complains on his lady's behalf against Master Geoffrey of Feering and Simon of Woodham

B73.(Surr') Johannes de Steyngreve cognovit quod debet Dyonia de Monte Kanis' ^{vque} marcas pro dampnis ei adjudicatis ut patet supra in placito de Hundredo de Reygate de quibus reddet ei medietate ad Natale domini anno xliii. Et alteram medietatem ad Purificacionem Beate Marie proximo sequentem.. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris et catallis etc.

B73.(Surrey) John of Stangrove acknowledges that he owes Denise of Montechensey 5 marks for damages adjudicated to her as [is] shown above in a plea from the hundred of Reigate. He shall render half to her at the Nativity of the Lord year 43 [25 December 1258] and the other half at the Purification of the Blessed Mary [2 February]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands and chattels.
[Cross-reference: B68]

[Membrane 5]

Hundredum De Woking'

The Hundred of Woking

B74.(T) Juratores presentant quod Robertus Passelewe et Galfridus de Langel' quando fuerunt justiciarii ad placita tenenda de Foresta apud Geldeford' fecerunt amensurare terras Gilberti de Basewyk' et Johannis de Wyke et quamplurium liberorum hominum in Foresta de Wyndesor' et arentaverunt contra voluntatem suam ubi dominus Rex nullum dominicum habet. Et dicti homines super hac conqueritur. Ideo inde *loquendum cum domino Rege*.

B74.(T) The jurors present that Robert Passelewe and Geoffrey of Langley, when they were Justices of the Forest holding pleas at Guildford, caused the lands of Gilbert of Basewyke and John of Wyke and many other free men's [lands] in the Forest of Windsor to be surveyed, and against their will they have farmed out [the land] where the king has no demesne. The said men complain on this [matter]. So *it is to be discussed with the king*.

B75.(T) Totus comitatus queritur quod dominus Rex ad magnum detrimentum totius comitatus fecit amoveri comitatum tenendum apud Geldford in uno capite comitatus qui teneri solebat apud Ledered' in medio comitatu. Et petunt quod super hoc eis fiat justicia. Ideo inde *loquendum cum domino Rege*.

B75.(T) The whole county complains that the king, to the great detriment of the entire county, moved the county [court] to Guildford, at one end of the county, which [court] was accustomed to be held at Leatherhead in the center of the county. They request that on this they are shown justice. So *it is to be discussed with the king*.
[Cross-reference: B59]

B76. (T) Dicunt etiam quod dominus Rex deafforestavit ex voluntate sua Comitatum Surr' et postea illum (interimⁱ) afforestavit unde milites de comitatu petunt inde justiciam. Ideo *loquendum cum domino rege*. Et dicunt quod dominus Rex cepit de comitatu centum libras quando ipsum deafforestavit et fecit cartam suam de quietaclamacione predictae foreste et nichilominus ipsum interim afforestavit.

B76.(T) They also say that the king, at his own will, disafforested the county of Surrey and later re-afforested it. Wherefore, the knights of the county seek justice. So *it is to be discussed with the king*. They say that the king took one hundred pounds from the county when he disafforested it and made a charter of quitclaim concerning the forest. Nonetheless, in the

meantime he re-afforested it.

B77. Dicunt etiam quod Godefridus de Lyston' Ballivus Forestarii de Wyndesor' cepit de una careta pro chiminagio ii solidos ubi antiquietus non consueverunt dari nisi iiii^{Or} denarios [leaves off abruptly]

B77. They also say that Godfrey of Liston, the forest bailiff of Windsor, took 2 shillings per cart-load as a cart-toll where formerly it was accustomed to give but 4 pence[.]

B78. Dicunt etiam quod cum Gilbertus de Cronustok' ivit inter Hocham et redehuld' cum careta et hominibus suis quidam Fulco Kokerel ipsum verberavit et maletractavit et auferebat ab eo unam balistam et Walterum hominum suum verberavit etc. [leaves off abruptly]

B78. They also say that when Gilbert of Crastock was between Ockham and Redhill with his men and a cart-load Fulk Cokerel beat and maltreated him and took one crossbow from him and beat his man Walter.

B79. Convictum est quod Henricus Garget (quondam ballivusⁱ) injuste cepit de avena et feno Rogeri de Redehull' ad valenciam ii solidorum. Ideo consideratum est quod satisfaciat predicto Rogero de ii solidis. Et committatur *gaole*.⁶¹

B79. A jury determined that Henry Garget, once a bailiff, unjustly took oats and hay worth two shillings from Roger of Redhill. So it is adjudged that he shall satisfy Roger of the 2 shillings. He is to be committed to *gaol*.

B80. Dicunt villata de Wyndlesham et Bachete quod Johannes de Gatesden' dum fuit vicecomes fecit turnum suum bis per annum ubi nullus vicecomes ante ipsum consuevit facere nisi unum turnum in anno et cepit i marcam per annum de turno suo ubi prius non consuevit dari nisi dimidium marcam. Et sic presentat totus comitatus de villa in villam. Ideo *loquendum cum Rege*.

B80. The vills of Windlesham and Bagshot say that John de Gatesden, while he was sheriff, made his tourn twice per year, whereas no sheriff before him was accustomed to make but a single tourn. He took 1 mark per year from his tourn, where previously it was accustomed to give but a half mark. This is presented by the whole county vill by vill. So *it is to be discussed with the king*.

B81. Convictum est quod Henricus Garget quondam ballivus injuste cepit de Ade de Murehull' ii solidos, eo quod imposuit eidem Adam quod potuit cepisse quendam latronem et non cepit et hoc falso. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Henricus satisfaciat predicto Ade de ii solidis. Et committatur *gaole*.⁶²

B81. A jury determined that Henry Garget, once a bailiff, unjustly took 2 shillings from Adam of Murehill, beacuse he alleged that Adam was able to arrest a thief and he did not, and this [allegation is] false. So it is adjudged that Henry shall satisfy Adam of the 2 shillings. He is to be committed to *gaol*.

B82. Johannes de Eynford' de Hundredo de Waleton' captus pro suspicione latrocinii liberatur senescallo Archiepiscopi (Cant'ⁱ) in balliva usque in *crastinum*⁶³ etc.

B82. John of Eynsford from the hundred of Wallingford, arrested for suspicion of theft, is freed on bail to the seneschal of the archbishop of Canterbury until the *morrow*.

⁶¹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁶²Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁶³Margin note by scribe, cs.

- B83. Convictum est quod Henricus Garget injuste cepit de Phillipo le Ryche (iiii solidosⁱ) et (v solidosⁱ) viii (solidos^e) denarios de Johanne de Lalane. Ideo consideratum est quod satisfaciat eis de predictam pecuniam. Et Henricus in *misericordia*.⁶⁴
- B83. A jury determined that Henry Garget unjustly took 4 shillings from Philip le Riche and 5 shillings and 8 pence from John of Lalane. So it is adjudged that he shall satisfy them of the money. Henry [is] in *mercy*.
- B84. Convictum est quod Henricus Garget injuste imprisonavit Willelmum Farman per iiiiii^{or} dies. Ita quod ad introitum et exitum gaole pacavit ii solidos. Ideo consideratum est quod satisfaciat ei de ii solidis. Et sit in *misericordia*.⁶⁵
- B84. A jury determined that Henry Garget unjustly imprisoned William Farman for 4 days. Thus to enter and leave gaol William paid 2 shillings. So it is adjudged that he shall satisfy him of the 2 shillings. Henry is in *mercy*.
- B85. Convictum est quod idem Henricus injuste cepit ix solidos de Edithe que fuit uxori Roberti Pykenot. Et quia predicta Editha non sequitur consideratum est quod respondeat domino regi de ix solidis.⁶⁶ Item idem Henricus cepit de Petro de la Pleystowe ii solidos imponens ei quod fecit defaultam ad Hundredum de Woking' quam non fecit. Ideo consideratum [est] quod respondeat domino regi de predictis ii solidis⁶⁷ eo quod predictus Petrus non sequitur. Item idem Henricus cepit de Willelmo de Burgate ii solidos⁶⁸ pro cervisis vendita contra assisam de qua non fuit convictus. Item de Waltero de Crowmere ii solidos⁶⁹ eodem modo. Ideo predictus Henricus respondeat domino regi de predictis iiiii solidis. Et quod predicti Willelmus et Walterus non sequuntur.
- B85. A jury determined that the same Henry unjustly took 9 shillings from Edith who was the wife of Robert Pincotts. Since Edith has not sued, so it is adjudged that he shall answer to the king concerning the 9 *shillings*. Henry also took 2 shillings from Peter de la Plaistow, alleging that he defaulted from the hundred of Woking when he did not. So it is adjudged that he shall answer to the king concerning the 2 *shillings* because Peter has not sued. Henry also took 2 *shillings* from William of Burgate for ale sold against the assize for which [offence] he was not convicted. In the same way Henry [took] 2 *shillings* from Walter of Crowmarsh. So it is adjudged that Henry shall answer to the king concerning the 4 shillings, since Walter and William have not sued.
- B86.(crastino) Henricus Garget queritur de Johanne de Wygeford' quod cum Martinus filius Symonis et Matilda uxor eius dimissent ei xl acras terre cum pertinenciis in Merewe ad terminum v^{que} annorum termino incipiente ad festum sancti Michaelis anno xxxi. Et predictus Henricus per dimissionem illam exstitisset inde in saisina fere per duos annos, predictus Johannes ad festum sancti Laurencii anno xxxii eiecit ipsum de predicta terra et blada in eadem terra crescencia ad valenciam x marcarum asportavit contra pacem etc. Et unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl librarum. Et inde producit sectam etc.
- Et Johannes venit et deffendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene deffendit quod nunquam venit ad predictam [terram] nec ipsum inde eiecit nec predictam transgressionem ei fecit. Set dicit quod revera predicti Martinus et Matilda dimiserunt predicto Henrico predictam terram ad predictum terminum. Set dicit quod post mortem predicte Matilde

⁶⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁶⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁶⁶Margin note by scribe, ix. s. crossed out.

⁶⁷Margin note by scribe, ii. s. crossed out.

⁶⁸Margin note by scribe, ii. s. crossed out.

⁶⁹Margin note by scribe, ii. s. crossed out.

quedam Isabella soror predictae Matilde intravit predictam terram ut propinquior heres predictae Matilde postea vero predicta Isabella dimisit predictam terram ipsi Johanni. Et ipse Johannes postea dimisit predictam terram cuidam Alano. Et predictus Alanus dimisit eandem terram cuidam Gilberto de Basevil'. Et predictus Henricus postea venit ad predictum Gilbertum et petiit quod emendaret ei transgressionem ei factam de predicta terra de qua vi eiecitus fuit. Et predictus Gilbertus fecit pacem cum predicto Henrico et dedit ei quatuor marcas. Ita quod predictus Henricus remisit et quietumclamavit predicto Gilberto totum jus et clameum quod habuit in predicta terra et quamlibet transgressionem sibi inde factam. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam. Et Henricus similiter. Et quia hoc idem convictum est per xii juratores, consideratum est quod predictus Johannes eat inde sine die. Et predictus Henricus in *miserecordia*⁷⁰ pro falso clamore.

B86.(morrow) Henry Garget complains against John of Winkford that whereas Martin son of Simon and Matilda his wife demised 40 acres of land in Surrey to him for the term of 5 years beginning at the feast of Saint Michael year 31 [29 September 1247] [and] he by that demise stood in seisin for nearly two years, John, at the feast of Saint Laurence year 32 [10 August 1248], ejected him from the land and carried off crops growing on the land worth 10 marks. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 40 pounds. Thereon he produces suit.

John comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that he never went to the land nor did he eject him nor did he carry out the aforesaid transgression. But, he says that Martin and Matilda demised the land to Henry for the term, but after Matilda's death, a certain Isabel, Matilda's sister, entered the land as Matilda's nearest heir. Afterwards, she demised the land to John. John then demised the land to Alan. Alan then demised the land to Gilbert of Basevill. Henry afterwards came to Gilbert and sought to make amends for the transgression carried out against him concerning the land from which he was forcefully ejected. Gilbert made peace with Henry and gave him four marks. Thus, Henry remitted and quit claimed to Gilbert all right and claim which he had in the land and for whatever transgression done to him. On this he places himself on the country. Henry [does] likewise. Since the same is determined by a jury of 12, so it is adjudged that John is without a day. Henry [is] in *mercy* for false claim.

B87. Walterus de la Fenne queritur de Priore de Bermundes' quod subtraxit ei (cozredium^s) unius monachi [sui] quod habere debet in Prioratu suo de Bermundes' (tota vita etc.ⁱ) Et Prior venit. Et concordati sunt. Et est concordia talis, scilicet quod predictus Walterus remittit eidem Priori totum predictum corredium pro quatuor marcis de quibus ei reddet ad Purificacionem beate Marie anno xliii, duas marcas. Et ad festum Ascensionis domini proximo sequens, duas marcas. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

B87. Walter de la Fenne complains against the prior of Bermondsey that he withdrew the corrody of one monk which he ought to have his whole life in the Priory of Bermondsey. The prior comes. They are agreed. The agreement [is] as such namely, that Walter remits the corrody to the prior for four marks, for which the prior shall render two marks to him at the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 43 [2 February 1259] and two marks at the following feast of the Ascension of the Lord [22 May 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

Hundredum De Tendrig'

The Hundred of Tandridge

B88. Convictum est quod Johannes de Steyngreve clausit quandam viam regalem in Waggeshane et aravit et seminavit per quam omnes homines de patria solebant ire cum equis et caretis. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod (quod^f) prosternere faciat *purpresturam* illam et reficere dictam viam per visum juratorum. Et ad custum etc. Et predictus Johannes pro transgressionem

⁷⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

in *misericordia*.⁷¹

B88. A jury determined that John de Stangrove enclosed a royal way in Waggeshane on which all the men of the country were accustomed to come and go with horses and carts. [It was determined that] he plowed and sowed it. So the sheriff is ordered that he knock down that purpresture and repair the way at John's cost. John [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

B89. Convictum est quod Willelmus de Turbervill' et homines sui fecerunt quandam marleram in Waggeseane. Ita quod per hoc quod foderunt sub terra in predicta marlera: (artata^s) est quedam regala via ubi homines de patria ire consueverunt cum equis et caretis. Ideo preceptum est quod emendare faciat dictum viam ad custum etc. Et predictus Willelmus de Turbervill' pro transgressione in *misericordia*.⁷²

B89. A jury determined that William of Turbervill and his men made a ceratin marl-pit in Waggeseane. Thus, they have dug beneath the earth [such that] a certain royal way is narrowed where men from the country were accustomed to come and go with horse and carts. So it is ordered to make repairs to the way at [William's] cost. William of Turbervill [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

B90. Gregorius de Brodeham quondam vicocomes Surr' in *misericordia*⁷³ pro pluribus transgressionibus.

B90. Gregory of Broadham, once sheriff of Surrey, [is] in *mercy* for numerous transgressions.

[Membrane 5d.]

Adhuc De Hundredo De Tendrig'

Still Concerning the Hundred of Tandridge

B91.(Surr', Kant') Symon de Putinden' queritur de Gregorio de Brodehamme quod predictus Gregorius abstulit ab eo xx^{ti} marcas dum fuit vicecomes. Et quia nichil habet in comitatu isto, preceptum est vicecomiti Kant' quod habeat corpus eius hic *die Jovis* proxima ante festum sancti Nicholai.

B91.(Surrey, Kent) Simon of Puttenden complains against Gregory of Broadham that Gregory, while he was sheriff, took 20 marks from him. Since he has nothing in this county [by which he can be attached], the sheriff of Kent is ordered that he have his body here on the *Thursday* before the feast of Saint Nicholas [5 December 1258].

B92. Convictum est quod Prior de Tendrig' inclusit quandam aquam communem in Warlingeham ubi homines de Warlingeham adquare solebant averia sua (ad nocumentum totius patrieⁱ.) Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod aperire faciat predictam aquam per visum juratorum. Et Prior qui presens est in *misericordia*⁷⁴ pro transgressione.

B92. A jury determined that the prior of Tandridge, to the nuisance of the entire country, enclosed a communal watering-hole in Warlingham where the men of Warlingham were accustomed to water their beasts. So the sheriff is ordered to open the watering-hole by view of the jurors. The prior, who is present, is in *mercy* for the transgression.

B93.(Kant') Preceptum est vicecomiti Kant' quod capiat corpus Wakelini de la Dune et illud

⁷¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

salvo custodiat in priona ita quod habeat eum coram H. le Bygot in proximo adventu suo etc.

- B93.(Kent) The sheriff of Kent is ordered that he seize Wakelin de la Dune's body and hold him in custody in prison so that he shall have him before [Hugh] Bigod in his next coming [to these parts].
- B94. Willelmus le Duk' queritur de Alano Snoter ballivo quod predictus Alanus cepit ab eo v^{que} Boves et i vaccam et xliiii oves et eos retinivit per ii annos. Ita quod non potuit inde rehabere nisi tres Boves et i vaccam et xxi oves unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xx marcarum. Et inde producit sectam.
Et Alanus venit et deffendit quod non cepit predicta averia nec ea detinivit sicut ei imponit. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam. Et quia convictum est per xii juratores quod non cepit predicta averia consideratum est quod predictus Alanus inde sine die. Et Willelmus (leⁱ) Duk' in *miser cordia*.⁷⁵
- B94. William le Duke complains against Alan Snoter, a bailiff, that Alan took 5 oxen, 1 cow and 44 sheep from him and retained them for 2 years. Thus, he was able to regain but three oxen, 1 cow and 21 sheep. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 20 marks. Thereon he produces suit.
Alan comes and maintains that he neither took the beasts nor did he detain them as he alleges. On this he places himself on the country. Since, it is determined by a jury of 12 that he did not take the beasts, so it is adjudged that Alan is without a day. William le Duke [is] in *mercy*.
- B95. Convictum est per juratam in quam Gerardus de Evinton' se posuit quod predictus Gerardus injuste cepit de Alicie de Aula de Andestede (C solidosⁱ) imponens ei homicidium. Et predicta Alicia cognovit quod predictus Gerardus satisfaciat ei. Ideo predictus Gerardus in *miser cordia*⁷⁶ pro transgressionem.
- B95. It is determined by the jury on which Gerard of Evington placed himself that Gerard unjustly took 100 shillings from Alice de Aula from Ashstead, alleging homicide against her. Alice acknowledges that Gerard shall satisfy her. So Gerard [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.
- B96. Willelmus le Vineter queritur de Galfrido de Braybof quod predictus Galfridus ipsum inprisonavit in Castro de Reygate et ipsum inpriona detinuit in vigilia et in die sancti Martini usque post nonam anno quo dominus Rex primo fuit in Vascone et abstulit ei unum tonellum vini et xl galones de vino acro et unum gladum et unum acrum ad dampnum suum C solidorum. Et Galfridus venit et deffendit predictam transgressionem et inprisonamentum. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam. Et convictum est per juratam quod predictus Galfridus non fecit ei predictam transgressionem nec ipsum inprisonavit sicut ei imponit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Galfridus eat inde quietus.
- B96. William le Vintner complains against Geoffrey of Braibof that Geoffrey imprisoned him in Reigate Castle and detained him in prison on the vigils and on Martinmas [10 November], until after nones in the year in which the king first went to Gascony [1243]. He took one cask of wine, 40 gallons of vinegar, one sword and one bow from him to his loss of 100 shillings. Geoffrey comes and denys the transgression and imprisonment. On this he places himself on the country. A jury determined that Geoffrey did not carry out the transgression nor did he imprison him as he alleges. So it is adjudged that Geoffrey is quit.
- B97. Johannes de la Ruthe queritur de Johanne de Stanygrave quod ipse simul cum aliis ipsum verberavit et maletractavit contra pacem etc. Et Convictum est per juratam quod nullam injuriam ei fecit. Ideo Johannes Stanygrane inde quietus. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat (*crastino*ⁱ) Rogerum de Bodelesham, Hugonem de Chyvicton, Gilbertum de la

⁷⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Pende, Radulfum de la Hurne et Willelmum le Marescallum de quibus idem Johannes de la Ruthe queritur quod ei fecisse debuerunt predictam injuriam etc.

- B97. John de la Reed complains against John de Stangrove that he along with others beat and maltreated him against the peace. A jury determined that he did not injure him. So John de Stangrove is quit. The sheriff is ordered to make come on the *morrow* Roger of Bodelesham, Hugh of Chivington, Gilbert de la Pendell, Ralph de la Horne and William le Marshall about whom John de la Reed complains that they carried out the injury against him.

Hundredum de Farnham

The Hundred of Farnham

- B98. Henricus Garget cognovit quod debet Petro Bydun dimidiam marcam quam ei reddet ad Natalem domini anno xliii. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

- B98. Henry Garget acknowledges that he owes Peter Bidun a half mark which he shall render to him at the Nativity of the Lord year 43 [25 December 1258]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

Villata De Geldeford'

The Vill of Guildford

- B99. Juratores presentant quod cum villa de Geldeford' extenderetur coram Abbate de Persovere Esctaetore domini Regis ad xii marcarum predictus Abbas tradidit predictam villam Nicholao Wauncy ad firmam predictam et nichilominus reddendo ultra predictam firmam C solidos. Ita quod predicta villa omnino depauperatur ideo de incremento predictae firme *loquendum cum Rege*.

- B99. The jurors present that whereas the vill of Guildford was valued at 12 marks before the abbot of Pershore, the king's escheator, the abbot handed over the vill to Nicholas Wauncy at the aforesaid farm nonetheless [he had] to render 100 shillings beyond the farm. Thus, the vill is completely impoverished by the increase to the farm. *It is to be discussed with the king*.

- B100. Iidem juratores presentant quod Henricus Garget Ballivus de Geldeford' distrinxit pstores et Braseatores eiusdem (villa^s) et cepit ab aliquibus v solidos et ab aliquibus dimidiam marcam. Ita quod per vim et complusionem Braseatores et pstores de Geldeford' fecerunt finem premanibus cum predicto Henrico. Ita quod possent furmare et braseare contra assisam per totum annum. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Henricus sit in *misericia*⁷⁷ pro transgressionem. Et inhibitum est vicecomiti Surr' ne de cetero capiat huiusmodi fines etc.

- B100. The same jurors present that Henry Garget, bailiff of Guildford, distrained the bakers and brewers of the vill and took 5 shillings from some and a half mark from others. Thus, by force and complusion the brewers and bakers of Guildford paid Henry a fine in advance, so that they could bake and brew throughout the year against the assize. So it is adjudged that Henry is in *mercy* for the transgression. Henceforward, the sheriff of Surrey is prohibited from taking this kind of fine.

- B101.(Small cross) Item predicti juratores presentant quod Abbas de Persovere dum fuit escaetor levare fecit quedam molendina super aqua de Geldeford' ad opus domini Regis per que molendina pons eiusdem ville et Ecclesie sancti Nicholai minantur (runiam^s). Et similiter inundat aqua super curtilagios et domos quorundam manentium propre molendina illa ad maximum nocumentum ipsorum. Dicunt etiam quod predictus Abbas apropiavit domino regi quandam terram quam Walterus Balam prius tenuit ipso Waltero invito pro qua tamen

⁷⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

habuisse debuit de domino Regi C solidos et non dum habuit. Ideo *loquendum cum domino rege*.

B101.(Small cross) The jury also presents that the abbot of Pershore, while he was the escheator, raised a certain mills on the water at Guildford to the benefit of the king. As a result of the mills, the bridge in the vill and the church of Saint Nicholas are threatened with ruin. Likewise, the water floods the gardens and homes of those who reside next to the mills to their great nuisance. They also say that the abbot appropriated to the king land which Walter Balam previously held, against Walter's will, for which he ought to have 100 shillings from the king, nevertheless he does not yet have it. So *it is to be discussed with the king*.

B102. Item presentant quod dominus Rex tenetur hominibus de Geldeford' in centum libris argenti quas iidem homines ad mandatum domini Regis per minutas particulas accomodaverunt operatoribus cuiusdam talami quem dominus rex fieri fecit. Ideo modo *loquendum*.⁷⁸

B102. They also present that the king is held to the men of Guildford for one hundred pounds silver which the men have lent bit by bit at the king's orders for the workers on the chamber which the king caused to be built. So in the same way *it is to be discussed with the king*.

[Membrane 6]

Hundredum De Godalming

The Hundred of Godalming

B103.(T) Willelmus de Burhurst queritur de Hugone Dol et Willelmo de la Breche quod ipsi abstulerunt ab ipso vii quarteria siligii Et ii busselos fabarum et xii denarios ad dampnum suum xx^{ti} solidorum. Item quod abstulerunt ab eo unam caretatam feni pretii ii solidorum. Item depaverunt cum averiis suis vii acras terre seminatas de avena.

Et Hugo et Willelmus veniunt et dicunt quod juste ceperunt predicta Blada et fenum. Quia dicunt quod predictus Willelmus de Burhurst tenet terram suam de predicto Hugone Dol in villenagium. Et quia predictus Willelmus dedexit ei facere villanas consuetudines quas antea facere consuevit de tenemento quod de eo tenuit in villenagium et facere debuit ideo distrinxit ipsum per predicta blada. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Et Willelmus de Burhurst dicit quod liber homo est et libere tenet terram suam et per certum servitium sicut sokemanus de antiquo dominico domini Regis. Et hoc idem convictum est per juratam patrie ideo inquiratur de transgressione. Et convictum est per eosdem juratores quod predicti Hugo Dol et Willelmus de la Breche abstulerunt a predicto Willelmo de Burhurst iiii^{or} quarteria siligii pretium quarterii v solidorum, item i busselum Fabarum pretii vi denariorum, item unam caretatam herbe pretii vi denariorum, item depaverunt cum averiis suis vii acras avena seminatas. Ita quod devastaverunt ad valenciam viii^{to} quarteriorum avene pretium quarterii xviii denarii. Ita quod dampna que predictus Willelmus habuit taxantur ad xxxiii solidos. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus recuperet dampna sua que taxantur ad xxxiii solidos. Et Hugo et Willelmus de la Breche pro transgressione committantur *gaole*.⁷⁹ Postea fecit predictus Hugo finem per *xl solidos* et Willelmus fecit finem per *xx solidos*.

B103.(T) William of Burhurst complains against Hugh Dol and William de la Breche that they took 7 quarters of rye, 2 bushels of beans and 12 pence from him to his loss of 20 shillings. They also took one cart-load of hay worth 2 shillings from him. With their beasts, they also depastured 7 acres of land sown with oats.

Hugh and William come and say that they justly took the crops and hay. They say that William of Burhurst holds his land from Hugh Dol in villeinage and William failed to carry out villein services, which he was previously accustomed to make to him and ought to make

⁷⁸Margin note by scribe, lo. cum R.

⁷⁹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

for the tenement which he holds of him in villeinage. Thus, Hugh distrained him through his crops. On this he places himself on the country.

William of Burhurst says that he is a free man and holds his land freely by fixed services as a sokeman of the king's ancient demesne. This is determined by the jurors of the country, so the transgression is to be examined into. It is determined by the same jurors that Hugh Dol and William de la Brenche took from William of Burhurst 4 quarters of rye, worth five shillings a quarter, 1 bushel of beans, worth 6 pence, one cart-load of hay, worth 6 pence and with their beasts they also depastured 7 acres of sown oats. Thus, they devastated to the value of 8 quarters of oats, worth 18 pence a quarter. Thus, the damages which William had are assessed at 33 shillings. So it is adjudged that William recovers his damages which are assessed at 33 shillings. Hugh and William de la Breche are to be committed to *gaol* for the transgression. Afterwards, Hugh made fine for 40 *shillings* and William made fine for 20 *shillings*.

B104. Robertus Brixi queritur de Jordano preposito de Godalming' quod inprisonavit ipsum et cepit ab ipso unum quarterium avene pretii iiii solidorum antequam voluit ipsum deliberare. Ideo dictus Jordanus veniat *die Jovis*.

B104. Robert Brixi complains against Jordan the steward of Godalming, that he imprisoned him and took one quarter of oats, worth 4 shillings, from him before he would free him. So Jordan shall come on *Thursday*.

B105.(T, Loquendum) Eudonus de Tymberlegh' et alii homines de Whyteleg' quod fuit antiquum dominicum domini Regis et predecessorum suorum Regum Anglie queritur de Petro de Sabandia quod idem Petrus postquam dominus Rex nunc dedit ei predictum manerium, iam ^vque annis elapsis injuste accrevit redditum suum de xviii libris, vii solidis et vi denariis reddendis per annum plusquam antecessores sui reddere consueverunt temporibus quo predictum manerium fuit in manibus domini Regis et predecessorum domini Regis Regum Anglie. Et hoc idem convictum est per juratores patrie. Et quia predictus Petrus non est hic, ideo datus est eis dies in Crastino Purificacionis Beate Marie (ad parlamentumⁱ). Et tunc fiet inde justicia etc. Postea ad prefatum terminum venit predictus Petrus et dicit quod predictus Eudonus et alii homines sui de Wytel' nullam accocionem habere possunt versus eum tamquam sokemanni de antiquo dominico etc. quia dicit quod manerium de Whiteleg' nuncquam fuit dominicum domini regis de Corona. Immo de Baronia del Egle que aliquando fuit Eschaeta domini regis de terris Normannorum et quam iste dominus Rex ei dedit. Et quod ita sit ponit se super librum qui vocatur Domesday. Et quesitus est liber ille in quo compertum est quod Gilbertus filius Rycheri del Egle tenuit Whytele' quod Godwinus Comes tenuit, et tunc se defendebat pro xx hydis et postea tempore predicti Gilberti pro xii. Et fuerit ibi xvi caruce terre in dominico due et xxxvii villani et tres cottarii qui tenuerunt residuum. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Eudonus et alii nichil capiant per querelam istam set sint in *misericordia* pro falso clamore. Et Petrus inde sine die.

B105.(T, is is to be discussed) Eudo of Timperley and other men of Witley, which was the ancient demesne of the king and his predecessors, kings of England, complain against Peter of Savoy that, after the present king gave him this manor some 5 years ago, Peter unjustly increased their rent by 18 pounds, 7 shillings and 6 pence per year. [This was] more than his ancestors were accustomed to render during the time when the manor was in the hand of the king and his predecessors, kings of England. This is determined by the jurors of the country. Since Peter is not here, so a day is given them on the morrow of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [3 February] at the parliament. Then justice will be done thereon. Afterwards, at the stated term, Peter comes and says that Eudo and his men of Witley are not able to have action against him as sokemen of ancient demesne. Since, he says that the manor of Witley was never the crown's demesne, rather it belonged to the barony of Eagle which was once the king's escheat of the lands of the Normans and which the king gave him. On this he places himself on the book called Domesday. The book is examined, in which it is discovered that Gilbert son of Richer del Eagle held Witley, which [manor] Earl Godwin had held, and was then valued at 20 hides and later in Gilbert's time at 12. There was land for 16

ploughs, two in demesne, 37 villeins and 3 cottars who held the remainder. So it is adjudged that Eudo and the others take nothing by this complaint, but they are in *mercy* for false claim. Peter is without a day.

Hundredum De Blakehethfend'

The Hundred of Blackheath

B106. Herbertus de Somerbyr' in *misericordia*⁸⁰ pro falso calmore versus Gerardus de Evinton' per plegium Johannis de Wauton'.

B106. Herbert of Summersbury [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Gerard of Evington, by pledge of John of Walton.

B107. Lucia de Chinthurst [queritur] de Ricardo de Tumsamsted' et Matilde uxore eius quod predicti Ricardus et Matilda detinent ei annuatim de annuo reddito duo quarteria Siligii et dimidia quarteria ordnii et unum quarterium avene et unam libram lane in quibus predicti Ricardus et Matilda ei annuatim tenentur ad vitam ipsius Lucie de quadam terra quam tenent ratione custodie quam habent de herede cuiusdam Normanni de Tangely quondam viri ipsius Matilde. Et unde dicit quod predictus Normannus toto tempore suo reddidit eidem Lucie predictum annuatim redditum. Et post mortem predicti Normanni predicta Matilda antequam predictus Ricardus eam desponsasset et predictus Ricardus postquam desponsavit predictam Matildam reddiderint eidem Lucie predictum redditum quousque iam tribus annis (elapsisⁱ) quod predicti Ricardus et Matilda subtraxerunt se de reddendo predictum annuatim redditum. Dicit etiam quod injuste subtraxerunt se a predicto tempore de inveniundo eidem Lucie domum ubi bene posset hospitari et pasturam ad unam vaccam unde dicit quod deteriorata est et dampnum habet ad valenciam C solidorum. Et inde producit sectam.

Et Ricardus et Matilda veniunt et dicunt quod non tenentur ei in predicto annuo redditu. Quia dicunt quod quedam convencione facta fuit inter predictum Normannum de Tangely et predictam Luciam quod predictus Normannus redderet predictae Lucie predictum redditum pro quadam dimidia virgate terre in Chinthurst quam predicta Lucia ei vendidit ad vitam ipsius Normanni et non ad vitam ipsius Lucie unde precise deffendit quod predicta Lucia nunquam post mortem predicti Normanni recepit predictum annuatim redditum. Et de hoc ponunt se super patriam. Et Lucia similiter. Et quia convictum est per xii juratores quod predicti Ricardus et Matilda tenentur predictae Lucie in predicto redditu (ad vitam ipsius Lucieⁱ) et similiter ad inveniendum ei domum ad hospitandam et pasturam ad i vaccam ratione heredis predicti Normanni quem habent in custodia. Et quod predictus Normannus toto tempore suo reddidit predictae Lucie predictum redditum et post mortem predicti Normanni, predicti Ricardus et Matilda similiter quosque subtraverunt se a festo Annuncionis Beate Marie anno xl, consideratum est quod predicta Lucia recuperet saisinam suam et arreragia sua. Et predicti Ricardus et Matilda commitantur *gaole*⁸¹ pro injuste detentione.

B107. Lucy of Chinthurst [complains] of Richard of Unstead and Matilda his wife that they withheld a years rent concerning a yearly rent of two quarters of rye, a half quarter of barley, one quarter of oats and one pound of wool in which Richard and Matilda are held to Lucy for her lifetime, for the land which they hold by reason of the custody which they have of the heir of Norman of Tangley, once Matilda's husband. Lucy says that Norman, for his entire lifetime, rendered Lucy the yearly rent. After Norman's death, Matilda, before Richard married her and after he had married her, rendered Lucy the rent until three years ago when Richard and Matilda withdrew themselves from rendering the yearly rent. She says that they have unjustly withdrawn themselves from the aforesaid time from finding Lucy a house where she is able to be accommodated and pasture one cow. Wherefore, she says that she has suffered damage to the value of 100 shillings. Thereon she produces suit.

Richard and Matilda come and say that they are not held to her in a yearly rent, since

⁸⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁸¹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

they say that an agreement was made between Norman of Tangle and Lucy that Norman would render the rent to Lucy, for Norman's lifetime and not Lucy's, for a half virgate of land in Chinthurst which Lucy sold him. Wherefore, they expressly deny that Lucy, after Norman's death, received the yearly rent. On this they place themselves on the country. Lucy [does] likewise. Since it is determined by 12 jurors that Richard and Matilda are held to Lucy for the rent for Lucy's lifetime, and to find her accommodation and to pasture 1 cow by reason of Norman's heir whom they have in custody and since Norman for his whole lifetime rendered the rent to Lucy and after his death Richard and Matilda [did] likewise until they withdrew themselves at the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary year 40 [15 August 1256], so it is adjudged that Lucy recovers her seisin and her arrears. Richard and Matilda are to be committed to *gaol* for unjust detention.

B108. Johannes de Okhurst queritur de Gerardo de Evinton' quod injuste cepit ab ipso xl solidos. Et convictum est quod in injuste queritur. Ideo Johannes in *misericordia*.⁸²

B108. John of Oakhurst complains against Gerard of Evington that he unjustly took 40 shillings from him. It is determined that John complains unjustly. So John [is] in *mercy*.

B109. Convictum est quod Gerardus de Evinton' dum fuit vicecomes injuste cepit de Johanne de Hamme iiii solidos. Ideo consideratum est quod respondeat ei de iiii solidis et Gerardus in *misericordia*⁸³ pro transgressione.

B109. A jury determined that Gerard of Evington, while he was sheriff, unjustly took 4 shillings from John of Ham. So it is adjudged that he shall answer to him concerning the 4 shillings. Gerard [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

B110. Convictum est quod Petrus de Holeweye cepit injuste (cepitr) de Willelmo de la Brech' i quarterium avene. Ideo satisfaciat ei de predicta avena. Et Petrus pro transgressione in *misericordia*.⁸⁴

B110. A jury determined that Peter of Holloway unjustly took 1 quarter of oats from William de la Breche. So he shall satisfy him of the oats. Peter [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

B111. Johannes de Okhusrt in *misericordia*⁸⁵ pro falso clamore versus Ricardus de Loxlegh'.

B111. John of Oakhurst [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Richard of Loxley.

B112. Convictum est quod Ricardus de Frollebyr' et Radulfus de Monstede Bedelli Hundredi de Godalming' injuste ceperunt Willelmum de la Brech' ad hundredum Episcopi Sar' in Godalming' et ipsum imprisonaverunt. Ideo consideratum est quod predicti Ricardus et Radulfus committantur *gaole*⁸⁶ pro [falso] inprisonamento et sciendum quod predictus Willelmus non sequebatur versus eos etc. Postea venit predictus Ricardus et finem fecit pro ii *macris*⁸⁷ per plegium [blank]

B112. A jury determined that Richard of Frollesbury and Ralph of Munstead, the beadlers from the hundred of Godalming, unjustly seized William de la Breche at the hundred of the bishop of Salisbury in Godalming and imprisoned him. So it is adjudged that Richard and Ralph are to be committed to *gaol* for [false] imprisonment. It is known that William has not sued them. Afterwards, Richard came and made fine for 2 *marks* by pledge

⁸²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁸³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁸⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁸⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁸⁶Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁸⁷Margin note by scribe, ii. m. crossed out.

B113.(T) Lucia de Fay queritur de Henrico de Merwe quod cum quidam Galfridus de Alneto teneret de ipsa Lucia dimidiam virgatem terre cum pertinentiis in manerio de Bromlegh' quod est antiquum dominicum domini Regis. Et ipsa Lucia post mortem predicti Galfridi intrasset predictam terram ratione custodie ([cum] ^{il}) Odonio filio Roberti de alneto fratris (ipsius Galfridiⁱ) predictus Henricus de Merwe implacitavit ipsam Luciam de predicta terra in curia de Bromlegh'. Ita quod ipsa Lucia semel se fecit essoniare versus predictum Robertum. Et cum consuetudo curie de Bromlegh' et in curiis omnium maneriorum que sunt de antiquo dominico domini Regis sit talis quod qui inplacitatur in eisdem curiis se possit essoniare primo, secundo et tercio de curia in curiam predictus Henricus post primam essoniam quod predicta Lucia fecit in abstencia ipsius Lucie processit ad inquisitionem in quam eadem Lucia se non posuit et ipsam Luciam de predicta terra eiecit et catalla sua in eadem terra asportavit ad valenciam xl solidorum. Et Henricus venit et dicit quod [post] mortem predicti Galfridi de alneto Robertus de alneto frater predicti Galfridi concessit eidem Henrico medietatem predicte terre per servitium quod perquieret eadem terra. Ita quod (perquisivit^s) habere et dictam terram recuperavit ut attornatus predicti Roberti et saisinam predicte terre recepit per consideracionem curie de Bromlegh'. Et de hoc ponit se (superⁱ) patriam. Et Lucia similiter.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Galfridus de Alneto obiit seysitus de predicta terra. Et quod Robertus frater predicti Galfridi concessit medietatem predicte terre predicto Henrico per servitium quod (perquisivit^s). Ita quod predictus Henricus perquisivit habere et recuperavit predictam terram in curia de Bromlegh' ut attornatus predicti Roberti, set dicunt quod predictus Robertus nunquam in vita sua venit ad predictam curiam ad ponendum predictum Henricum in saisina de medietate predicte terre nec ad capiendum saisinam predicte terre. Et quia convictum est per eandem juratam quod predictus Robertus obiit et quod quidam Odo filius suus qui venit et est de etate xvii annorum est propinquior heres ipsius Roberti consideratum est quod predictus habeat saisinam suam de predicta terra. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eidem Odonum habere saisinam suam etc.

B113.(T) Lucy of Fay complains against Henry of Merrow that, whereas Geoffrey of Alneto held a half virgate of land of Lucy in the manor of Bromley which is the king's ancient demesne and Lucy, after Geoffrey's death, entered the land by reason of the custody [along with] Odo son of Robert of Alneto, Geoffrey's brother, Henry of Merrow pleaded Lucy concerning the land in the court of Bromley. Thus, Lucy essoined [herself] one time against Robert. Whereas, the custom of the court of Bromley, and in all the courts of all the manors which are the king's ancient demesne, is as such, that whoever pleads in these courts is able to essoin one, two and three times from court to court; after the first essoin which Lucy made, Henry, in Lucy's absence, proceeded on [with] the inquiry on which Lucy had not placed herself, and he ejected her from the land and carried off her chattels worth 40 shillings. Henry comes and says that after Geoffrey's death, Robert of Alneto, Geoffrey's brother, granted Henry half of the land for the service which pertains to the land. Thus, he obtained and recovered the land as Robert's attorney and he retained seisin of the land by verdict of the court of Bromley. On this he places himself on the country. Lucy [does] likewise.

The jurors say that Geoffrey of Alneto died seized of the land. Robert, his brother, granted Henry half of the land for the service pertaining to it. Thus, Henry obtained and recovered the land in the court of Bromley as Robert's attorney, but they say that Robert never in his lifetime came to court to place Henry in seisin of half of the land nor to take seisin of the land. Since, it is determined by the same jury that Robert died and that Odo his son, who came and is 17 years old, is Robert's nearest heir, so it is adjudged that he shall have his seisin of the land. The sheriff is ordered to make Odo have his seisin.

Hundredum de Godeleye

The Hundred of Godley

B114. Convictum est quod Galfridus de Lesinan et ballivi eius fecerunt extendi cunieram de Biflet'. Ita quod est (^{il})ati suo ad ducento cuniculos et quilibet cuniculus appreciatus [est] ad vi denarios. Et tradiderunt predictam cunigeram hominibus de Biflet' ad respondendum

(indeⁱ) predicto Galfrido de Lesinan de C solidis. Et predicti Galfridus et ballivi eius ceperunt primo anno omnes cuniculos et nichilominus ceperunt de predictis hominibus per tres annos sequentes *xv libras* scilicet quolibet anno C solidos. Ideo inde *loquendum* etc.

B114. A jury determined that Geoffrey de Lusignan and his bailiffs valued the rabbit warren of Byfleet so that it is () his at two hundred rabbits and each rabbit [is] appraised at 6 pence. They handed over the rabbit warren to the men of Byfleet to answer to Geoffrey de Lusignan for 100 shillings. At the beginning of each year, Geoffrey and his bailiffs took all the rabbits and nonetheless took 15 pounds from the men for three consecutive years, namely 100 shillings each year. So *it is to be discussed*.

B115. Convictum est quod predictus Galfridus de Lesinan injuste et per districionem cepit *xl solidos* de Henrico persona de Byflet'. Eo quod predictus Henricus levavit quoddam fossatum ultra terram suam ubi nullus habet chiminum vel aliud juris. Item injuste cepit de villata de Byflet' per tres annos quolibet anno *xl solidos* pro quodam subbosco quem idem Galfridus vendidit aliis. Et de quodam Roberto de Lathe injuste [cepit] *xxxv solidos*. Et interim de eodem *xl solidos* (per tres annosⁱ) pro quadam Bruera quam ballivi predicti Galfridi ei vendiderunt. Et quam predictus Galfridus postea vendidit aliis. Item idem Galfridus injuste cepit de villata de Waybrigg' *xx solidos*. Item quod cepit de hominibus de Biflet' *xii libras* injuste pro arreragio cuiusdam propositi sui de eadem villa. Ideo inde *loquendum* ad parleamendum.

B115. A jury determined that Geoffrey de Lusignan unjustly and by distraint took *40 shillings* from Henry the parson of Byfleet because Henry raised a dike upon his land where he had no way or any other right. Geoffrey also unjustly took *40 shillings* each year, for three years, from the vill of Byfleet for an underwood which Geoffrey sold to others. He unjustly [took] *35 shillings* from Robert of Lathe. In the meantime, Geoffrey [took] *40 shillings*, for three years, from the same [Robert] for a heath which Geoffrey's bailiffs sold to him and which Geoffrey later sold to others. Geoffrey also unjustly took *20 shillings* from the vill of Weybridge. He also unjustly took *12 pounds* from the men of Byfleet for arrears to his stewards of the vill. So *it is to be discussed* at the parliament.

Effingham⁸⁸

[Membrane 6d.]

Adhuc De Hundredo De Godeleye

Still Concerning the Hundred of Godley

B116. Magister Andreas le Coverus in *misericordia*⁸⁹ pro transgressione purpresture.

B116. Master Andrew le Roofer [is] in *mercy* for a purpresture.

B117. Convictum est quod quidam Adam de Wautham quondam senescallus Abbatis de Certes' voluit distringere plures liberos homines de Hundredo de Godeley' ad faciendam sectam ad dictum Hundredum de tribus septimanas in Tres septimanas ubi non solebant facere sectam nisi semel in anno ad unum layheday. Et cepit iam sex annis elapsis tempore Abbatis qui nunc est de quolibet de predictis hominibus i denarium per annum (pro predicta secta.ⁱ) Et testatum est quod predictus Adam obiit. Ideo preceptum est predicto Abbati quod teneat predictos liberos homines in statu suo in quo prius fuerunt et decetero remittat predictas exactiones. Et quia convictum est quod predictus Abbas adhuc manutenet predictam exactionem, ideo predictus Abbas in *misericordia*.⁹⁰

⁸⁸This place name is entered at the very foot of the membrane without an entry mark thus *ff*.

⁸⁹Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

⁹⁰Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

- B117. A jury determined that Adam of Waltham, once the seneschal of the abbot of Chertsey, sought to distrain many free men from the hundred of Godley to do suit to the hundred every three weeks, whereas they were not accustomed to do suit but once a year for one lawday. For the aforesaid suit he took 1 pence from each man for the six years of the current abbot. It is testified that Adam died. So the abbot is ordered that he shall hold the free men in the state in which they were previously in and henceforward cease the exactions. Since, it is determined that the abbot still maintains the exaction, the abbot [is] in *mercy*.
- B118. Convictum est quod Gregorius de Gravene (injusteⁱ) citavit Ricardum de Graveneye apud Wynton' et fecit ipsum per occasionem illam amittere ad valenciam xl solidorum. Ideo predictus Gregorius in *misericordia*.⁹¹
- B118. A jury determined that Gregory of Graveneye unjustly summoned Richard of Graveneye to Winchester and caused him to lose 40 shillings on that occasion. So Gregory [is] in *mercy*.
- B119. De purprestura dicunt quod Radulfus de Rokesber' fecit quandam purpresturam in regali (viaⁱ) in Rokesbyr' (ad nocumentum totius patrieⁱ) Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod aperiri faciat viam et purpresturam illam amoveri quantum fuerit ad nocumentum etc. per visum juratorum et ad custum ipsius Radulfi. Et Radulfus in *misericordia*.⁹²
- B119. Concerning purpresture, they say that Ralph of Ruxbury made a purpresture on the royal way in Ruxbury to the nuisance of the entire country. So the sheriff is ordered to open the way and to remove that purpresture at Ralph's cost in as much as it was a nuisance. Ralph [is] in *mercy*.
- B120. Item dicunt quod Willelmus de la Lane inclusit quoddam regale chimunum in Horisell' ad nocumentum totius patrie. Ideo aperiatur per visum juratorum ut supra ad custum ipsius Willelmi. Et ipse Willelmus in *misericordia*.⁹³
- B120. They also say that William de la Lane enclosed a royal way in Horsley to the nuisance of the entire country. So it is to be opened as above and at William's cost. William [is] in *mercy*.
- B121. Juratores presentant quod cum Petrus de Glenchuche tenuisset quoddam Kay in Glenchuche de Abbate de Certesey Reddendo per annum duo quarteria salis, quidam Robertus de la Stone de novo levavit quoddam aliud Kay propter illud ad deterioracionem ipsius Petri. Et juratores quesiti si unusquisque pro voluntate sua levare possit Kay ibidem, dicunt quod non. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod habeat predictum Robertum hic *die Lune* ad respondendum inde etc.
- B121. The jurors present that whereas Peter of Glenchuche holds a wharf of the abbot of Chertsey in Glenchuche to render two quarters of salt per year, a certain Robert de la Stone recently raised another wharf nearby, to Peter's detriment. The jurors were asked if anyone is able to build a wharf there at his own will. They said no. So the sheriff is ordered that he have Robert here on *Monday* to answer.

Hundredum de Effingham

The Hundred of Effingham

- B122. Convictum est quod Johannes propositus de Bacham Gilbertus Elyet et Gilbertus le Bedell

⁹¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

vi recusserunt Willelmum le Wodeward quem vicecomes capi fecit (per indictamentum.ⁱ) Ideo committantur *gaole*. Post venit Abbas de Certes' et finem fecit pro predictis Johanne at aliis per *xl solidos*⁹⁴ per plegium Willelmi Picot et Ricardi de Kenebrigg'.

B122. A jury determined that John steward of Bakeham, Gilbert Elyet and Gilbert the Beadler forcefully 'rescued' William le Woodward whom the sheriff arrested by indictment. So they are to be committed to *gaol*. Afterwards, the abbot of Cherstey came and made fine for John and the others for 40 *shillings* by pledge of William Picot and Richard of Kenebrigg'.

B123.(Suwerk') Willelmus le Vineter Ballivus Comitis Warren' in Suwerk queritur de Galfrido Norman ballivo domini Regis de Suwerk' quod cum idem Comes et antecessores sui semper solebant habere terciam partem teolonii et omnium (amerciamentorum etⁱ) expletorum provenientium occasione dicti theolonii. Item cum ballivis domini Regis in eadem villa debeant esse predicto Comite jurati ad colligendum fideliter dictum theolonium et dictas expletas; predictus Galfridus detinet eidem Comite terciam partem amerciamentorum provenientium occasione predicti (theolonii.ⁱ) Et etiam non permitit ballivum suum de Suwerk' esse predicto Comiti juratum.

Et Galfridus venit et quo ad sacramentum fidelitatis quod predictus Willelmus dicit ballivos domini Regis facere debent ballivis predictis Comitis bene cognovit quod ballivis domini Regis in Suwerk' debet esse juratis ballivo predicti Comitis de fideliter colligendum theolonium predictae ville et concedit quod ballivi sui decetero faciant predictum sacramentum etc. Et de predicto theolonio dicit quod predictus Comes debet habere terciam partem predicti theolonii. Set bene deffendit quod predictus Comes nec antecessores sui unquam habuerunt terciam partem amerciamentorum provenientium occasione dicti theolonii. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam salvo jure domini Regis. Et predictus Willelmus salvo jure domini sui similiter ideo fiat inde jurata. Et convictum est per xii juratores quod predictus Comes et omnes antecessores sui semper fuerunt in seisin de tercia parte theolonii proveniente in Suwerk'. Set dicunt quod nunquam fuerunt (in seisinaⁱ) de tercia parte amerciamentorum provenientium occasione dicti theolonii. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus le Vineter sit in *miserordia*⁹⁵ pro falso clamore. Convictum est quod predictus Galfridus non permisit ballivum suum de Suwerk' facere sacramentum fidelitatis ballivis predicti Comitis. Ideo predictus Galfridus in *miserordia*.⁹⁶

B123.(Southwark) William le Vintner, bailiff of the earl Warenne in Southwark, complains of Geoffrey Norman, the king's bailiff of Southwark, that since the earl and his ancestors were always accustomed to have a third part of the toll and all the amercements and profits arising on the occasion of the toll, [and] whereas the king's bailiffs in the same vill ought to be sworn to the earl to faithfully collect the toll and profits, Geoffrey detains the third part of the amercements arising on the occasion of the toll from the earl. He also does not allow his bailiff of Southwark to be sworn to the earl.

Geoffrey comes. As regards the oath of fealty that William says the king's bailiffs ought to show the earl's bailiffs, he readily acknowledges that the king's bailiff in Southwark ought to be sworn to the earl's bailiff concerning faithfully collecting the toll from the vill. He grants that his bailiffs, henceforward, shall take the oath. Concerning the toll, he says that the earl ought to have a third part of the toll, but he readily denys that the earl or his ancestors ever had a third part of the amercements arising out of the toll. On this he places himself on the country, saving the king's right [to answer]. William [does] likewise saving his lord's right [to answer], so let there be a jury trial thereon. It is determined by 12 jurors that the earl and all his ancestors were always in seisin of a third part of the toll in Southwark. But, they say that they were never in seisin of a third part of the amercements arising from the toll. So it is adjudged that William le Vintner [is] in *mercy* for false claim. It is [also] determined that Geoffrey did not allow his bailiff of Southwark to swear fealty to the earl's

⁹⁴Margin note by scribe, xl. s. crossed out.

⁹⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

bailiffs. So Geoffrey [is] in *mercy*.

B124. Convictum est quod Johannes de Elinton' ballivus Galfridi de Lesinan injuste cepit de Roberto de Cruce de Bissele ad opus domini sui *xx solidos* et unum porcum (pretii¹) *duorum solidorum*. Et similiter quod alii ballivi ipsius Galfridi injuste ceperunt de villa de Bissel' *unam marcam*, una vice et interim *xxiii*^{Or} *solidos* pro quadam extensione quam Willelmus de Bussey fecerit ultra valorem redditum tenentium eiusdem ville. Ideo *loquendum*.

B124. A jury determined that John of Ellington, Geoffrey de Lusignan's bailiff, unjustly took 20 *shillings* and one pig worth *two shillings* from Robert de Cruce of Bisley. Likewise, Geoffrey's other bailiffs, one time, unjustly took *one mark*, and in the meantime [they took] 24 *shillings* for a certain survey which William de Bussey made beyond the value of tenants' rents in the vill. So *it is to be discussed*.

B125. Willelmus de la Fermerye queritur de Ricardo de Kenebrig' quod idem Ricardus injuste extorsit ab eo dimidiam marcam dum fuit ballivus. Imponens ei quod predictus Willelmus debuit ameriari coram justiciariis cum ipse non fuerat ameriatus ad aliquem denarium et hoc idem convictum fuit coram W. de Exemue Inquisitore per preceptum domini regis qui tunc preceperat eidem Ricardo quod satisfaceret ei de predicta dimidia marca et non dum ei satisfecit. Et quia hoc idem convictum est per juratam consideratum est quod predictus Ricardus satisfaciatur ei de predicta dimidia marca. Et sit in *misericordia*⁹⁷ pro detentione. Et predictus Willelmus similiter in *misericordia*⁹⁸ pro falso clamore de verberatura uxoris sue de qua questus fuit versus eundem Ricardum.

B125. William de la Fermerye complains against Richard of Kenebrig' that, while Richard was a bailiff, he unjustly extorted a half mark from him, alleging that William was amerced before the justices. Whereas, he was not amerced for any [amount] of money and this was determined before [William] of Exemue the inquisitor, by order of the king, who then ordered Richard to satisfy him of the half mark. Richard has not yet satisfied him. Since, this determined by a jury, so it is adjudged that Richard shall satisfy him concerning the half mark. He [is] in *mercy* for detention. William, likewise, [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Richard concerning a beating to his wife about which he was examined.

B126. Convictum est quod Galfridus Spendelone (dum fuit ballivus regis Aleman¹) per extorsionem cepit de Roberto Somersweyn de Certeseye xii denarios et de Thome de Pirye dimidiam marcam et de Abbate de Certeseye xx denarios et de vicario de Egham. Ideo eis respondeat de predictis denariis si habeat unde. Et preceptum est vicecomiti Buk' quod faciat eum venire. Postea testatum est quod Galfridus utlagatus est in Comitatu Buk'. Ideo nichil de eo.

B126. A jury determined that Geoffrey Spindle Lane while he was the the king of Germany's bailiff by means of extortion took 12 pence from Robert Somersweyn of Chertsey, a half mark from Thomas of Pirie, 20 pence from the abbot of Chertsey and [the same amount] from the vicar of Egham. So he shall answer to them for the money if he has it. The sheriff of *Buckinghamshire* is ordered to make him come. Afterwards, it is testified that Geoffrey is outlawed from the county of Buckinghamshire. Nothing [is] known of him.

B127.(Essex) Convictum est quod Godfridus de Liston' injuste et per extorsionem cepit de Julianna de Burghstowe *xl solidos*. Ideo in *misericordia*⁹⁹ et reddit predictae Julianne predictos denarios.

B127.(Essex) A jury determined that Godfrey of Liston unjustly and by means of extortion took 40 *shillings* from Juliana of Burstow. So he [is] in *mercy* and he shall return the money to

⁹⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Juliana.

B128. Juratores presentant quod idem Godefridus de Liston' injuste levavit novam consuetudinem et dari fecit pro quolibet porco pro pannagio in bosco de la Frith' duos denarios, ubi prius nunquam solebant dare nisi tantum unum denarium. Dicunt etiam quod Ricardus Batabye injuste levavit aliam novam consuetudinem capiendō de qualibet bestia (i obulum¹) pro pannagio [et] herbagio in predicto bosco de la Firth', ubi nichil unquam solebat dari ea de causa. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

Dicunt etiam quod Godefridus de Liston', Jacobus le Glovere de Wyndlesore et Henricus de Coleburne cum debuissent clausisse (ut solebant¹) quandam purpresturam in veteri Wyndlesor' quam tenuerunt ad firmam de domino rege; ipsi dimiserunt predictam purpresturam gratis apertam ea occasione ut averia hominum de comitatu isto intrare possent et tunc inparcaverunt predicta averia et ceperunt pro inparcamento eorumdem averiorum ad voluntatem suam ad nocumentum totius patrie. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

B128. The jurors present that the same Godfrey of Liston unjustly raised a new custom [namely that one was] to give 2 pence for each pig to pannage in the wood of Frith, whereas previously one was accustomed to give but only one pence. They also say that Richard Batabye unjustly raised another new custom, taking for each beast a half penny for pannage and pasture in the wood of Frith, whereas it was never customary to give for that purpose. So *it is to be discussed*.

They also say that Godfrey of Liston, James le Glover of Windsor and Henry of Coldbourne, while they ought to enclose a purpresture, as they were accustomed to in the vert of Windsor, which they held at farm from the king, [instead] they demised the purpresture and freely opened it on this occasion so as to allow the men of the county's beasts to enter. Then they impounded the beasts at their own will and seized them for imparking to the nuisance of the entire country. So *it is to be discussed*.

B129.(T) Galfridus de Lucy queritur de Galfrido de Lezinan quod cum ipse extitisset in custodia ipsius Galfridi de Lezinan, idem Galfridus destruxit boscos et vinaria sua in manerio de Byflet, et similiter non sustinuit domos in eodem manerio. Ita quod per defectum sustentacionis earundem permisit eas depire et cadere. Et etiam quod cum ipse Galfridus acquietasse (debuit¹) scutagium quod debebatur pro eodem manerio dum fuit custodia eiusdem, illud soluere noluit, per quod idem Galfridus (de Lucy¹) soluit Abbati de Certes' xx solidos pro defecto acquietancie ipsius Galfridi de Lezinan. Unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam centum librarum etc. Et quia nullus venit qui respondeat pro predicto Galfrido, ideo inquiratur rei veritas per patriam.

Et juratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Galfridus de Lerinan dum fuit custos ipsius Galfridi vendi fecit in bosco de Byflet trescentas quercus pretii Sexaginta librarum. Dicunt etiam quod predictus Galfridus de Lucy deterioratur per hoc quod predictus Galfridus permisit domos deperire ad valenciam viginti librarum. Et quod per (defectum¹) acquietancie ipsius Galfridi de Lerinan soluit predictus Galfridus de Lucy Abbati de Certes' predictos xx solidos. Ideo inde *loquendum*¹⁰⁰ etc. Et dictum est predicto Galfrido quod sit in Crastino Purificacionis apud Westmonasterium etc.

B129.(T) Geoffrey de Lucy complains against Geoffrey de Lusignan that while he stood in Geoffrey de Lusignan's custody, Geoffrey de Lusignan destroyed his woods and vineyards in the manor of Byfleet and likewise did not maintain the buildings on the manor. Thus, by their failure to be maintained, he allowed them to fall to ruin. [He] also [complains] that whereas Geoffrey ought to acquit him of scutage, which is owed for the manor while it was in his custody, he did not wish to pay it. Thus Geoffrey de Lucy paid the abbot of Cherstey 20 shillings for Geoffrey de Lusignan's failure to acquit himself. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of one hundred pounds. Since no one came who is able to answer for Geoffrey so the truth is to be inquired into by the country.

The jurors say upon their oath that Geoffrey de Lusignan, while he was Geoffrey's

¹⁰⁰Margin note by scribe, lo. cum R.

guardian, sold three hundred oaks worth sixty pounds from the wood of Byfleet. They also say that Geoffrey de Lucy suffered loss to the value of 20 pounds since Geoffrey allowed the buildings to go to ruin. For Geoffrey de Lusignan's failure to acquit himself, Geoffrey de Lucy paid the abbot of Chertsey 20 shillings. *So it is to be discussed with the king.* It is said to Geoffrey that he be at Westminster on the morrow of the Purification [3 February].

[Printer Anomaly--see page 106]

[Membrane 7]

Villata de Kingeston'. De Querelis.

The Vill of Kingston Concerning Complaints

B130. Walterus Cardun queritur de Petro Tarent, quod cum idem Petrus dimisisset ei quamdam terram in Norberton' ad terminum sex annorum et post predictum terminum tenendam tota vita ipsius Walteri pro L^a solidis eidem Petro reddendis, idem Petrus simul cum Viviano de Tyukeham, Rogero Doming', Johanne de Newgate, Johanne Avrey, Willelmo Pottere, Ricardo Spayne, Willelmo de Cheyham, Hugone Bolle, Ricardo Fore et Radulfo Figge ipsum Walterum a domo sua in predicta terra exsistente eiecit infra terminum predictum et contra scriptum suum, et catalla sua ibidem inventa ad valenciam x librarum cepit et asportavit, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xx librarum etc.

Et Petrus venit. Et bene defendit quod nullam injuriam ei fecit, nec aliqua catalla ipsius Walteri cepit nec asportavit. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Petrus infra precitum terminum eiecit ipsum Walterum a predicta domo, et quamdam partem prati ipsius Walteri falcari fecit, et inde vendidit herbam ad valenciam xii denariorum et etiam duas gallinas in predicta domo inventas (concedit^s) pretii trium denariorum. Set dicunt quod nulla alia catalla ibidem cepit, nec asportavit. Ideo Consideratum est quod predictus Petrus satisfaciatur predicto Waltero de predictis denariis. Et sit in *misericordia*¹ pro transgressione. Et Walterus similiter in *misericordia*² pro falso clamore versus eum. Et Vivianus et alii non venerunt. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod habeat eos crastino.

Post veniunt predicti Vivianus et alii. Et Walterus non vult sequi versus eos. Ideo predicti Vivianus et alii sine die. Et Walterus in *misericordia*.³

B130. Walter Cardun complains against Peter Tarent that whereas Peter demised land in Norbiton to him for the term of six years and after that term to hold for the rest of Walter's lifetime for 50 shillings, Peter, along with Vivian of Twickenham, Roger Doming, John of Newdigate, John Avery, William Poter, Richard Spains, William of Cheam, Hugh Bolle, Richard Fore and Ralph Figg, within the term ejected Walter from his house and against his deed. They carried off his chattels found there, worth 10 pounds. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 20 pounds.

Peter comes. He readily maintains that he made no injury to him nor did he seize or carry off Walter's chattels. On this he places himself on the country.

The jurors say that Peter, within the term, ejected Walter from the house and mowed part of Walter's meadow. Thereafter, he sold the hay worth 12 pence. He also ([killed]) 2 hens worth 3 pence found at his home. But, they say that he neither seized nor carried off any other chattels. So it is adjudged that Peter shall satisfy Walter of the money. He [is] in *mercy* for the transgression. Likewise, Walter [is] in *mercy* for false claim against him. Vivian and all the others have not come. So the sheriff is ordered to have them on the morrow.

Afterwards, Vivian and the others come. Walter does not wish to sue them. So Vivian and the others are without a day. Walter [is] in *mercy*.

B131. Convictum est per juratam in quam Galfridus Norman se posuit, quod idem Galfridus injuste cepit de Radulfo Fayrhod unum quaterium mixtillum, pretii vii solidorum pro dimidia marca in qua Willelmus de Strode et Johannes de Camera ei tenebantur. Ideo in *misericordia*.⁴ Et predictus Radulfus non sequitur. Ideo nullam fiat ei inde satisfactionem.

B131. A jury determined by the jury on which Geoffrey Norman placed himself that Geoffrey

¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

unjustly took one quarter of mixed corn, worth 7 shillings, from Ralph Fayrhod for a half mark in which [debt] William of Strood and John de Camera were held to him. So he [is] in *mercy*. Ralph does not sue. So there [is] no satisfaction thereon.

B132. Walterus Cardun cognovit quod debet Petro Tarent duas marcas et dimidiam, de quibus ei reddet ad Pascha anno xliii, xl denarios et ad festum sancti Michaelis proximo sequens xl denarios. Et postea per duos annos sequentes (utroque anno¹) ad Pascha dimidia marca. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat etc.

B132. Walter Cardun acknowledges that he owes Peter Tarent two and a half marks of which he shall pay him 40 pence at Easter year 43 [13 April 1259] and 40 pence at the following feast of Saint Michael [29 September]. Afterwards, for the following two years [he shall pay] a half mark at Easter. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may [levy the amount from his lands].

B133. Convictum est per juratam in quam Petrus le Templer se posuit quod idem Petrus cepit de Margerie de la Bergh' dimidiam marcam de quodam amerciamento ad quod ipsa amerciari debuit in Comitatu Surr' tempore quo Aumfridus de Fering' fuit vicecomes. Post venit predictus Aumfridus et bene cognoscit quod amerciata fuit coram eo set non ad dimidiam marcam, immo dicit quod revera idem Petrus devenit plegios ipsius Margerie de misericordia sua postquam ipsa recesserat, et dicit quod si ipsa fuit amerciata ad dimidiam marcam, hoc fuit per predictum Petrum, et non per ipsum. Et juratores super hoc quesiti, hoc idem testatur, et hoc bene intelligunt per hoc quod contentio prius fuerat inter ipsum et predictam Margeriam et quod predictus Petrus devenit plegius suus in absencia sua. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Petrus sit in *misericordia*.⁵ Et satisfaciat eidem Margerie de iiii^{or} solidis et viii denariis. Ita quod duo solidis remaneat predicto Aumfrido vicecomite pro predicta misericordia ipsius Margerie tantummodo pro paupertate ipsius Margerie. Item idem Petrus convictus est per confessionem suam propriam quod detiuit eidem Margerie xiii solidos iam tribus annis elapsis, que ei adjudicati fuerit coram H. de Mara pro (datallis⁸) suis que arrestavit. Ideo Consideratum est quod satisfaciat ei de predictis xiii solidis. Et sit in misericordia pro detentione.

B133. A jury determined by the jury on which Peter le Templer placed himself that Peter took a half mark from Marjery de la Bregsells for an amercement for which she was amerced in the county of Surrey during the time when Humfrey of Feering was sheriff. Afterwards, Humfrey comes and he readily acknowledges that she was amerced before him, but not at a half mark. Rather, he says that Peter found pledges for Marjery for her amercement after she had left. He says that if she was amerced at a half mark, it was by Peter and not by him. The jurors concerning the above were examined on this. They testified that as they understood it there had been an earlier argument between him and Marjery on this and that Peter found her pledges in her absence. So it is adjudged that Peter is in *mercy*. He shall satisfy Marjery of the 4 shillings and 8 pence. Thus, only two shillings shall remain to Humfrey the sheriff for Marjery's amercement, because Marjery [is] poor. Peter is found guilty by his own admission that, three years ago, he withheld the 8 shillings from Marjery which were adjudicated to her before [Henry] de Mara, for her chattels which he seized. So it is adjudged that he shall satisfy her for the 8 shillings. He is in *mercy* for detention.

B134. Juratores presentant quod Prior de Bisopesgat' obstruxit quoddam chiminum (reale⁸) inter Ditton' et Stok' ad nocumentum totius patrie. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod predictum chiminum aperire faciat quantum fuerit ad nocumentum etc. Et ad custum ipsius Prioris. Et Prior in *misericordia*.⁶

B134. The jurors present that the prior of Bishopsgate obstructed a royal way between Ditton and Stoke to the nuisance of the entire country. So it is adjudged that the way is to be opened at

⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

the prior's cost in as much as it was a nuisance. The prior [is] in *mercy*.

B135.(Loquendum cum rege) Juratores presentant quod Galfridus de Lezinan dimisit Lamberto de Leges manerium de Hammes cum pertinenciis tenendum a festo sancti Michaelis anno xl, usque ad terminum novem annorum proximo sequentium (Reddendo inde x libras et xvi solidos per annum.ⁱ) Et postquam idem Lambertus extiterat in seisinā per unum annum et amplius Ademarius Electus Wynton' ipsum inde pro voluntate sua eiecit. Et ballivi ipsius Electi adhuc tenent ipsum Lambertum extra manerium illud. Et juratores quesiti, que dampna predictus Lambertus sustinivit occasione predictae eiectionis, dicunt ad valenciam C solidorum.

B135.(To be discussed with the king) The jurors present that Geoffrey de Lusignan demised the manor of Ham to Lambert of Leigh to hold from the feast of Saint Michael year 40 [29 September 1256] through the following nine years, to render 10 pounds and 16 shillings per year. After Lambert stood in seisin for one year and more, Aymer the Elect of Winchester at his own will ejected him. The elect's bailiffs still hold Lambert outside that manor. The jurors were asked what damages Lambert sustained on the occasion of the ejections. They say [he suffered damage] to the value of 100 shillings.

B136. Homines domini Regis de Nortberton' queruntur de Nicholao clerico ballivo Radulfi de Hegham Cancellari Sar' quod cum ipsi et antecessores eorum a tempore a quo non extat memoria semper extiterunt in seisinā communicandi cum omnimodis averiis suis in villa de Cumbe in omnibus campis, pratis et pasturis eiusdem excepto quodam parco in eadem villa existente, predictus Nicholaus deforciat eis predictam communam, unde dicunt quod deterioratus est et dampnum habent ad valenciam etc.

Et Nicholaus venit et dicit quod nullam injuriam eis fecit quia dicit quod quidam Herbertus tempore quo Johannes de Nevill' heres predicti manerii fuit infra etatem et in custodia sua tenuit homines predictos extra predictam communam, et quod ipse Nicholaus tenet eos in eodem statu in quo predictus Herbertus eos tenuit. Et hoc idem convictum est per juratam. Et ideo predicti homines nichil capiant per querelam istam, set perquirant sibi per breve domini Regis etc.

B136. The king's men of Norbiton complain against Nicholas clerk, a bailiff of Ralph of Hegham chancellor of Salisbury, that whereas they and their ancestors from time out of mind always stood in seisin of the rights of common with their animals in the vill of Combe in all the fields, meadows and pastures, with the exception of a park in the vill, Nicholas deforced them of the common. Wherefore, they say they have suffered damage to the value etc.

Nicholas comes and says that he did not injure them. He says that a certain Herbert held the men outside the common from the time when John de Nevill, heir of the manor, was under age and in his custody. And he holds them in the same state in which Herbert held them. This is determined by a jury. So the men take nothing by this complaint. Let them obtain a royal writ instead.

B137.(T) Robertus de Meleburn' et Emma et uxor eius queruntur de Gwydoni de Lezinan quod idem Gwido ipsos eiecit de manerio suo de Shenēs die sancti Martini anno xli et eos tenuit extra manerium illud usque ad festum Purificacionis beate Marie proximo sequens quando predicti Robertus et Emma finem fecit cum predicto Gwydone per xxvii libras argenti antequam potuerunt habere ingressum in predictum manerium, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xxx^{ta} librarum. Et inde producit sectam. Et quia nullus venit qui respondeat pro predicto Gwydone, ideo inquiratur veritas per patriam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera quidam Johannes conversus aliquo tempore duxerat predictam Emmam in uxorem. Et in processu temporis petiit predicta Emma ipsum Robertum in virum in curia Christianitatis querens divorcium inter ipsam et predictum Johannem. Ita quod eadem Emma disrationavit ipsum Robertum tamquam virum suum. Et post divorcium celebratum inter ipsam et predictum Johannem accessit predictus Robertus simul cum predicta Emma ad predictum manerium de Shenēs et posuerunt se in seisinā de eodem manerio quod est de hereditate ipsius Emme et quodam manerio idem Johannes prius

tenuerat cum predicta Emma. Et postmodo accessit idem Johannes ad predictum Gwidonem dicens se jus habere in eodem manerio et taliter locutus fuit cum predicto Gwidone quod idem Gwido nomine ipsius Johannis eiecit predictos Robertum et Emmam de predicto manerio et eos tenuit extra manerium illud quousque iidem Robertus et Emma finem fecerunt cum predicto Gwidono per predictas xx^{lii} libras. Et ideo dictum est predictos Roberto et Emme quod sunt ad proximum Parliamentum apud Westmonasterium. Et interim *loquendum cum domino rege.*

- B137.(T) Robert of Melbourne and Emma his wife complain against Guy de Lusignan that Guy ejected them from their manor of Sheen at Michaelmas year 41 [29 September 1257] and held them outside the manor until the following feast of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [2 February] when Robert and Emma made a fine with Guy for 27 pounds silver so that they could enter the manor. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 30 pounds. Thereon he produces suit. Since no one came who can answer for Guy so the truth is to be inquired by the country.

The jurors say that John, a convert, once took Emma in marriage. In the course of time Emma sought Robert for her husband in court-Christian, seeking a divorce from John. Thus, Emma divorced her husband John. After the divorce was settled, Robert, along with Emma, entered the manor of Sheen and placed themselves in seisin of the manor, which is Emma's by inheritance. John had previously held the manor with Emma. Afterwards, John approached Guy claiming to have the right of the manor himself. Such was the agreement with Guy that he, in John's name, ejected Robert and Emma. Guy held them outside that manor until Robert and Emma made fine with Guy for 27 pounds. It is said to Robert and Emma that they are to be at the next parliament at Westminster. In the meantime *it is to be discussed with the king.*

- B138. Juratores presentant quod Ricardus Hule fecit purpresturam super viam regiam in villa de Talewurth' de longo duarum perticarum ad nocumentum totius patrie. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod aperire faciat chimum predictum quantum fuerit ad nocumentum etc. et ad custum ipisus Ricardi. Et Ricardus in *miserecordia*.⁷

- B138. The jurors present that Richard Hule made a purpresture two perches long on the royal way in the vill of Talworth to the nuisance of the entire country. So the sheriff is ordered to open the way at Richard's cost in as much as it was a nuisance. Richard [is] in *mercy*.

- B139. Radulfus le Cornmongere et Sarra uxor eius queruntur de Petro le Templar quod cum ipsi post mortem cuiusdam Fordwyne primi viri ipsius Sarre fuissent in seisina de custodia (terreⁱ) et Johannis filii et heredis predicti Fordwine et eandem custodiam tenuissent per decem annos et amplius predictus Petrus in principio autumpni anno xxxviii subtraxit eis predictum Johannem, et similiter eiecit ipsos de predicta custodia, scilicet de xiiii^{or} acris terre cum pertinenciis et blada in eadem terra existencia asportavit, contra pacem etc. Unde dicunt quod deteriorati sunt et dampnum habent ad valenciam etc.

Et Petrus venit et hoc idem cognoscit. Et quia testatum est quod predictus Johannes est plene etatis, Consideratum est quod predictus Petrus satisfaciatur predictis Radulfo et Sarra de dampnis suis Que taxantur per juratam ad xxxv soildos.

- B139. Richard le Cornmonger and Sarah his wife complain of Peter le Templar that whereas they after the death of Fordwine, Sarah's first husband, were in seisin of the custody of the land and John, Fordwine's son and heir, and they have held the custody for ten years and more, Peter, at the beginning of the autumn year 38 [1254], withdrew John and ejected them from the custody, namely from 14 acres of land, and he carried off the crop standing on the land. Wherefore, they say they have suffered damage to the value etc.

Peter comes and acknowledges this. Since it is testified that John is of full age, so it is adjudged that Peter shall satisfy Ralph and Sarah of their damages which were assessed by the jury at 35 shillings.

⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

[Membrane 7d.]

Adhuc de Villata de Kingeston'

Still Concerning the Vill of Kingston

B140. Johannes Radchot queritur de Waltero Kardun quod idem Walterus eiecit eum de dimidia acra terre cum pertinenciis in Kingeston', quam Petrus de Tarent eidem Johanni dimisit ad terminum quatuor annorum qui non dum preteriit. Et postea quia (idem¹) Johannes petiit ab eo emendam de predicta injuria predictus Walterus traxit ipsum in placito in curia Christianitatis et eum citare fecit in Diocesa Norwyc' et alibi et taliter eum vexabat quod non potuit pacem habere quousque finem fecit cum predicto Waltero per xx solidos quos extorsit ab eo, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl solidorum.

Et Walterus venit. Et defendit totum. Et ponit se inde super patriam. Et juratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Petrus de Tarent dimisit predicto Johanni predictam dimidiam acram terre ad terminum. Et postea dimisit idem Petrus predicto Waltero Kardun residuum totius terre in predicta villa occasione cuius dimissionis eiecit idem Walterus ipsum Johannem de predicta terra. Ita cum quod idem Johannes antequam eiectus fuit de predicta terra metere fecit bladum in terre illa existente et cariare usque ad domum patris sui in eadem villa. Et postea citare fecit idem Walterus predictum Johannem per litteram papalem apud Luthingland in Diocesa Norwyc'. Ita quod predictus Johannes ob gravem vexacionem illam remisit eidem Waltero totum terminum suum, et similiter vesturam illius dimidie acre terre ei reddidit, et preterea xxⁱⁱ solidos argenti pro pace habenda. Et ideo Consideratum est quod predictus Johannes recuperet terminum suum. Et predictus Walterus satisfaciatur ei de predictis xxⁱⁱ solidis et de dampnis suis que taxantur per juratam ad [blank] . Et Walterus in *miserordia*⁸ pro transgressionem.

B140. John Radcot complains against Walter Cardun that Walter ejected him from a half acre of land in Kingston which Peter of Tarent demised to John for the term of four years which have not yet expired. Afterwards, since John sought amends from him for the injury, Walter took him to court-Christian and summoned him to the diocese of Norwich and elsewhere and vexed him so that he was not able to have the peace, until he made a fine with Walter for 20 shillings which he extorted from him. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 40 shillings.

Walter comes and denys everything. He places himself on the country. The jurors say upon their oath that Peter of Tarent demised the half acre of land to John for the aforesaid term. Afterwards, Peter demised the remainder of the land in the vill to Walter and on the occasion of the grant Walter ejected John. Thus, John, before he was ejected from the land, reaped the crop standing on the land and carted it to his father's house in the vill. Afterwards, Walter summoned John by papal letters to Lothingland in the Diocese of Norwich. Thus, John, on account of the great harassment remitted his whole term and the crop on the half acre of land to Walter. Afterwards, he rendered Walter 20 silver shillings to have the peace. So it is adjudged that John recovers his term. Walter shall satisfy him of the 20 shillings and his damages which were assessed by the jury at . Walter [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

B141. Robertus Wymund' que questus fuit de Priore de Bissopegat' de quibusdam arboribus suis per ipsum Priorem prostratis et asportatis non est prosecutus ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *miserordia*,⁹ scilicet Radulfus Radchot et Petrus Tarent.

B141. Robert Wymond, who complained that the prior of Bishopsgate knocked down and carried off his trees, has not prosecuted his suit, so he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely Ralph Radcot and Peter Tarent.

⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

B142. Petrus le Templer queritur de Waltero Kardun quod cum idem Petrus vendidisset eidem Waltero dimidiam marcam redditus cum pertinentiis in Kyngeston' tenendam de predicto Petro (per servicium¹⁰) ii solidorum per annum et iniunxisset eidem Waltero quod confecerit inde cartam de feoffamento in forma predicta predictus Walterus confecit cartam illam reddendo eidem Petro per annum unum clavum gariophilio pro omne servicio et legit cartam predictam coram ipso Petro, reddendo predictos duos solidos. Ita quod idem Petrus tradidit ei sigillum suum apponendum predictae Carte eo quod credidit ei. Item queritur de eodem Waltero quod idem Walterus postea die veneris proximo ante Pentecostum anno xlii fecit ipsum citari coram Commissario Magisteri Rustandi usque Luthingland in Diocesa Norwyc' quod esset ibi die Martis sequente respondere eidem Waltero super quibusdam injuriis et interim mandavit idem Walterus predicto Petro per vicarium de Kingeston' quod ipse noluit sequi in causa illa versus eum, qua de causa idem Petrus non comparuit ibidem nec pro se misit procuratorem. Et nichilominus comparuit predictus Walterus predicto die martis et prosequabatur versus (eum.¹¹) Ita quod fecit ipsum Petrum excommunicari ab contumaciam suam ad diem illum. Ita quod quidam Willelmus Pycot amicus ipsius Petri in absentia sua composuit cum predicto Waltero et promisit eidem Waltero xl solidos scilicet pro pace habenda. Ita cum quod idem Walterus bona fide promisit quod nichil inde perceperet. Et nichilominus excommunicari fecit predictum Petrum de die in diem, quousque predicti xl solidi fuerunt ei plenarie persoluti. [blank] Idem queritur quod predictus Walterus in vigiliam sancti Laurencii anno predicto postquam firma pax domini regis ei data fuit de predicto Waltero coram H. le Bygod capitale justiciario apud Bermendes' circa horam vesperam insultavit ei ad capud ville de Kingeston' in regali via. Ita quod vix evasit usque ad domum cuiusdam Roberti Balbe in eadem villa, et postea levavit hutesium super ipsum Petrum ac si idem Petrus ei insultaretur. Et unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam C solidorum etc.

Et Walterus venit et defendit totum et ponit se super patriam. Et queritur de predicto Petro quod ipse predicto die ei insultavit contra pacem etc. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam. Et iuratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Walterus insultavit predicto Petro in forma predicta et non idem Petrus ipsi Waltero. Dicunt etiam quod idem Walterus extorsit a predicto Petro predictos xl solidos in forma predicta. Et similiter quod predictus Walterus confecit predictam cartam maliciose ipso Petro ignorante sicut predictum est. Et ideo Consideratum [est] quod predictus Petrus quo ad querelam ipsius Walteri inde sine die. Et quod predictus Walterus satisfaciat eidem Petro de predictis xl solidis et similiter de dampnis suis que taxantur per juartam ad . Et predictus Walterus *custodiat*.¹⁰ Post venit predictus Walterus et finem facit per *v marcas*¹¹ per plegium Ricardi de Havering', Thome Aurifaber juxta pontem Lond', Petri le Templer, Radulfi de Imworth' et Radulfi Wakelyn.

B142. Peter le Templer complains against Walter Cardun that whereas Peter sold Walter a half mark of rent in Kingston to hold of Peter for the service of 2 shillings per year and he enjoined Walter to make a charter of enfeoffment in the aforesaid form, Walter made that charter to render to Peter one clove of garlic for all service, although he read the charter aloud before Peter to render two shillings. Thus, Peter handed over his seal to him to affix to the charter, because he believed him. He also complains that Walter, later on the first Friday before Pentecost year 42 [10 May 1258], summoned him to be before Commissioner Master Rostand at Lothingland in the Diocese of Norwich on the following Tuesday [14 May] to answer to Walter concerning certain injuries. Meanwhile, Walter, through the vicar of Kingston, sent word to Peter that he did not wish to sue him in this case, on account of which Peter did not appear there nor did he send a proctor. Nevertheless, Walter appeared on the Tuesday and sued against him. Thus, Peter was excommunicated on that day to his contumacy. When William Picot, Peter's friend, appeared in his absence and settled with Walter and promised Walter 40 shillings to have the peace, Walter on his own faith promised that he would not collect it. Nevertheless, he had Peter excommunicated from day to day until the 40 shillings were fully paid to him.----- Peter also complains that Walter, in

¹⁰Margin note by scribe, c. crossed out.

¹¹Margin note by scribe, v. m. crossed out.

the vigils of Saint Laurence [9 August] after the king's firm peace was given to him concerning Walter, before [Hugh] Bigod Chief Justiciar at Bermondsey, around about the hour of vespers, insulted him at the end of the vill of Kingston on the royal way. Thus, he barely escaped to Robert Balbe's house in the same vill. Afterwards, Walter raised the hue on him, as if he had insulted him. Wherefore, Peter says that he suffered damage to the value of 100 shillings.

Walter comes and denys all and places himself on the country. He complains against Peter that he on the aforesaid day insulted him against the peace. On this he places himself on the country. The jurors say upon their oath that Walter insulted Peter in the aforesaid manner and not Peter to Walter. They also say that Walter extorted the 40 shillings from Peter in the aforesaid manner. Likewise, Walter maliciously contracted the charter, Peter being ingnorant, just as is stated. So it is adjudged that as regards Walter's complaint Peter is without a day. Walter shall satisfy Peter of the 40 shillings and likewise for his damages which were assessed by the jury at [blank]. Walter is to be taken into *custody*. Afterwards, Walter came and made fine for 5 marks by pledge of Richard of Havering, Thomas the Goldsmith next to London Bridge, Peter le Templar, Ralph of Imworth and Ralph Wakelin.

B143.(Suwerk') Presentatum est per juratores quod quidam Portus antiquitus esse solebat in terra Roberti de Uggel' in Suthwerk' qui vocabatur Saltflet in quo naves et Batelli cum sale et aliis (rebus¹) solebant habere refugium in tempore hyemali expectanto tydas aque Tamisie, et quod idem Robertus obstruxit placiam illam et ibi construxit quandam grangiam ad nocumentum patrie et ad deterioracionem ville de Lond' et ville de Suthwerk'. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod aperiri faciat placiam illam in statum pristinum et ad custum ipsius Roberti. Et Robertus in *misericordia*¹² per plegium Henrici de Denleg' et Roberti le Benere.

B143.(Southwark) It is presented by the jurors that a certain dock called Saltfleet on Robert Ugley's land in Southwark is ancient custom at which ships and boats with sails and other things were accustomed to have refuge at low tide to await the tides on the River Thames and Robert obstructed that place. He built a grange there to the nuisance of the entire country and to the detriment of the vill of London and the vill of Southwark. So the sheriff is ordered to clear that place and to make it as if new at Robert's cost. Robert [is] in *mercy* by pledge of Henry of Dunley and Robert le Boonworker.

B144. Ricardus de Hamme ballivus de Essere in *misericordia*¹³ pro transgressione eo quod convictum est quod injuste cepit averia hominum domini Regis de Kingeston' et Hammes in communia pasture ipsorum.

B144. Richard of Ham, bailiff of Esher, [is] in *mercy* for a transgression, because it was determined that he unjustly seized beasts belonging to the king's men of Kingston and Ham, from within their common pasture.

B145. Juratores presentant quod Magister Hospitali sancti Johanni in Anglia iam v^{que} annis elapsis subtraxit homines suos de Tallewrth' a decenna domini Regis de Kingeston'. Ita quod nullam sectam faciunt ad curiam de Kingeston' quam semper usque tunc facere consueverunt. Et preterea ab eodem tempore subtraxerunt domino Regi unum quaterium avene annuatim quod dominus Rex semper usque tunc percipere consuevit. Et preterea cum dominus Rex semper solebat habere Weyf' per totum Hundredum de Kingeston' predicti hospitalarii a tempore quo feoffati fuerunt per Henricum Kyryel de ----- feodo dimidie militis cum pertinenciis in Talewrth' infra predictum hundredum deforciaverunt domino Regi Weyf' veniens super predictum feodum. Et similiter deforciavet domino Regi sectam ad curiam suam de Kingeston' debitam pro predicto tenemento et consuetam. Item subtraxit domino Regi tallagium de hominibus suis de Talewrth' quando dominus Rex talliat dominica sua. Et etiam quando predictum hundredum communiter amerciatur pro murthero vel aliqua alia

¹²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

transgressionem, predicti hospitalarii non permittunt homines suos in aliquo participare de predicta misericordia cum predicto hundredo nec ipsos ratione predicti tenementi desicut nichil habuerunt in predicta terra nisi de feofamento predicti Henrici. Et ballivi predicti Prioris presentes sunt et nichil ostendunt per quod predictae libertates -----debeant pertinere ad predictum Priorem. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat decetero predictum Priorem ad faciendam sectam de predicto tenemento ad predictum hundredum. Et similiter ad omnia res missa quatenus fieri consuevit tempore quo predictum tenementum fuit in manum predicti Henrici Kyrel. Et pro arerragio et dampno domini Regis que taxantur per juratam--- ad *xii solidos et vi denarios*. Et similiter pro predicto Weyf cum contigerit. Et Prior in *misericordia*.¹⁴

- B145. The jurors present that the Master of the Hospital of Saint John in England, some 5 years ago, withdrew his men of Talworth from the king's tithing of Kingston. Thus, they make no suit at the court of Kingston, which until then they were accustomed to make. Moreover, from that time on they have withdrawn from the king one quarter of oats which until then he was accustomed to collect yearly. Furthermore whereas the king was always accustomed to have 'waivery' throughout the whole hundred of Kingston, the hospitallers, from the time when they were enfeoffed by Henry Crioil of ----- a half kinghts fee in Talworth within the hundred, deforced the 'waivery' coming to the king from the fee. Likewise, he deforced the king of suit at his court of Kingston owed for the tenement and customary. He also withdrew from the king the tallage from his men of Talworth when the king tallaged his demesne. Also, when the hundred was communally amerced for murder or any other transgression, the hospitallers did not allow their men to participate in any way in the amercements with the hundred, nor [did they] themselves [take part] by reason of the tenement, as they have nothing in aforesaid land except from Henry's enfeoffment. The prior's bailiffs are present and they cannot show how [such] liberties ----- ought to pertain to the prior. So the sheriff is ordered that henceforward he shall distrain the prior to make the suit to the hundred for the tenement. Likewise [he shall distrain him] for all which was customarily given for the tenement from the time when it was in Henry Crioil's hand [and] for the king's arrears and damages which were assessed by the jury at---*12 shillings and 6 pence* and likewise for the 'waivery' belonging to it. The prior [is] in *mercy*.

Hundredo de Emelebrigg'

The Hundred of Elmbridge

- B146. Juratores presentant quod post mortem Galfridi de Luscy quando dominus Rex contulit custodiam maneriorum de Bifflet', Waybrigg' et Rusleye Galfrido de Lezinan fratri suo fecit idem Galfridus de Lezinan extendere predicta maneria per quendam Willelmum de Bussey. Ita quod tenentes de eisdem maneriis qui nunquam prius talliati fuerunt nisi ad xl solidos tantummodo per extensionem illam semper postea dum predictus Galfridus tenuit predictum manerium talliati fuerunt ad *C solidorum*. Ita quod iidem tenentes omnino destriuntur. Dicunt etiam quod idem Galfridus per predictum tempus extorsit quolibet anno injuste de predicta villata de Weybrigg' (dimidiam marcā¹) pro quadam communā pasture qua tenentes eiusdem ville semper usque tunc pasifice et quiete usi fuerunt absque aliqua contradictione. Ideo inde *loquendum*.
- B146. The jurors present that after Geoffrey de Lucy's death when the king surrendered the custody of the manors of Byfleet, Weybridge and Rusleye to his brother Geoffrey de Lusignan, Geoffrey extended the manor through William de Bussey. Thus, the tenants at these manors who were previously never tallaged, except only at 40 shillings, by that extent were always afterwards tallaged at *100 shillings* while Geoffrey held the manor. Thus, the tenants all came to ruin. They also say that Geoffrey, for that time, extorted a half mark each year from the vill of Weybridge for the common pasture which the tenants of the vill always until then peacefully and freely made use of without any contradiction. So *it is to be*

¹⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

discussed.

B147.(A small cross) Juratores presentant quod Ademarius Electus Wynton', iam tribus annus elapsus levavit quandam Barreram in villa de Esse(re)ⁱ extraverso regalis chimini ubi caretta libere et absque contradicione transire solebant. Et modo non permittet caretas transire nisi dent theolonium scilicet quelibet caretta plus vel minus pro voluntate ballivorum suorum ad dampnum patrie quinque solidos. Dicunt etiam quod idem Electus apropiavit sibi quandam placiam in Essere in qua Hundredum de Emelebrigg' semper teneri consuevit. Et placiam illam inclusit et inclusam tenuit fere per duos annos ad dampnum Radulfi de Emmewrth' ballivi dicti hundredi, qui hundredum illud tenet de domino Rege ad feodi firman i marcam. Eo quod illi qui (illi)^r sectam debuerunt ad hundredum illud noluerunt sequi nisi ad locum consuetum. Ideo inde *loquendum*. Et quia convictum est per juratam quod predictus Electus levavit predictum Barreram ad nocumentum patrie ut predictum est preceptum est; vicecomiti quod prosternere faciat predictam barreram.

B147.(A small cross) The jurors present that Amyer the Elect of Winchester, some three years ago, raised a barrier across the royal way in the vill of Esher where carts were accustomed to cross freely without any contradiction. Now, he does not allow the carts to cross unless they give a toll, namely more or less at his bailiffs' will for each cart, to the country's loss of five shillings. They also say that the elect appropriated to himself a certain place in Esher in which it was customary to hold the hundred of Elmbridge. He enclosed that place and held it enclosed for nearly two years to the damage of Ralph of Imworth, bailiff of the hundred, who held that hundred of the king at a farm-fee of 1 mark. Thus, those who ought to do suit at that hundred were unable to suit at the customary place. So *it is to be discussed*. Since it is determined that the elect raised the barrier to the nuisance of the country as is said, the sheriff is ordered to knock down the barrier.

[Membrane 8]

Hundredum de Effingham'

The Hundred of Effingham

B148.(Loquendum) Juratores presentant quod Galfridus de Lezinan dum habuit custodiam terre Galfridi de Lucy in Effingham extendi fecit communam pasture in predicta villa ad dimidiam marcam in qua communa homines eiusdem ville semper communare solebant. Et cepit a predictis hominibus pro communa predicta *xl solidos* per sex annos, scilicet quolibet anno dimidia marca ubi nunquam antea aliquid dare consueverunt pro communa illa habenda.

B148.(It is to be discussed) The jurors present that Geoffrey de Lusignan, while he had custody of Geoffrey de Lucy's land in Effingham, had the common pasture of the vill extended at a half mark, in which common the men of the vill were always accustomed to common. For six years he took *40 shillings* from the men for that common, namely a half mark each year, whereas never before were they accustomed to give in order to have that common.

B149. Ricardus le Tayllur de la Brochole in Effingham in *misericordia*¹⁵ pro falso clamore versus Robertum de Newenham, per plegium Hamoni de Planaz et Ricardi de Pollesden'.

B149. Richard le Tailor de la Brockholes in Effingham [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Robert of Newnham by pledge of Hamo of Planaz and Richard of Polesden.

Hundredum de Coppedethorn'

The Hundred of Copthorne

¹⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B150. Juratores presentant quod Prior de Merton' percipit emendas assise panis et cervisie non servate de hominibus in villa de Ewell'. Abbas de Certeseye similiter in Ewesham. Johannes de Abernun in Pekham, Stok' et Ledrede' nescunt quo waranto. Postea predicti juratores plenius inde quesiti dicunt quod a tempore a quo non extat memoria usi sunt libertate predicta. Ideo nichil.

B150. The jurors present that the prior of Merton collected a fine from the men of the vill of Ewell for the assize of bread and ale. The abbot of Chertsey [did] likewise in Ewesham. John of Abernun [did likewise] in Peckham, Stoke and Leatherhead [but] by what warrant they do not know. Afterwards, the jurors were fully examined [on this matter]. They say that since time out of mind they made use of the aforesaid liberty. So nothing [shall be done].

B151. Juratores presentant quod Willelmus Micheldererel injuste cepit de Willelmo Baldewini qui obiit dimidiam marcam. Ideo in *misericordia*.¹⁶

B151. The jurors present that William Micheldever unjustly took a half mark from William Baldwin, who died. So he [is] in *mercy*.

B152.(Loquendum) Convictum est per juratam quod Johannes de Gatesden' dum fuit vicecomes levavit quandam consuetudinem scilicet quod fecit duos turnos (per annumⁱ) in isto hundredo ubi alii vicecomites ante ipsum nunquam fecerunt per annum. Et quod idem Johannes cepit de singulis villatis in hundredo isto in duplum plus quam alii vicecomites percepere solebant ad Turnos suos. Ita quod Summa denariorum excedit per annum in isto hundredo ad sexaginta solidos. Et dicunt quod singuli vicecomes postea semper perceperunt istos denarios. Et similiter totius comitatus hoc idem recordatur quod vicecomites perceperunt de singuli villate istius comitatu.

B152.(It is to be discussed) A jury determined that John de Gatesden, while he was sheriff, raised a certain custom, namely that he made two tourns per year in this hundred whereas other sheriffs before him never made [but one] per year. John took double from each vill in this hundred, more than [the amount] which other sheriffs were accustomed to collect at their tourns. Thus, the sum of money exceeded sixty shillings per year in this hundred. They say that afterwards each sheriff always collected this sum. Likewise, the whole county records this, that the sheriffs collected [this sum] from each vill within this county.

B153. Juratores presentant quod antiquitus solebant Priores de Merton' habere visum franciplegii de hominibus Willelmi de Buttel' et antecessorum suorum in Ewell' vel percipere annuatim ii solidos. Et postea cepit quidam Henricus Prior de Merton' de hominibus predictis ii^{or} solidis pro predicto visu. Et quia juratores testantur quod hoc fuit ex voluntate ipsius Henrici Prioris inhibitus est Priori nunc, ne decetero capiat predictos ii^{or} solidos immo ii solidos ad plus vel habere visum Franciplegii sicut antiquitus facere consueverunt predecessori ipsius etc.

B153. The jurors present that the priors of Merton in former times were accustomed to have view of frankpledge from William of Butley's men and his ancestors in Ewell or [the priors were accustomed] to collect 2 shillings yearly. Afterwards, Henry, a prior of Merton, took 4 shillings from the men for view. Since the jurors testify that this was at Henry's will the present prior is henceforward prohibited from taking the 4 shillings, rather [he is to collect] the 2 shillings at most or have view of frankpledge as his predecessors were accustomed to do in former times.

B154. Gerardus de Evynton' cognovit quod cepit dimidiam marcam de Thome le Gras capto et inprisonato pro suspicione latrocinii per sic quod dimitteret ipsum per plevinam usque in adventu justiciarii, eo quod dicit quod firmarius fuit istius comitatu et quod ipse cepit hoc sicut alii vicecomites ante ipsum capere consueverunt de consimilibus. [leaves off abruptly]

¹⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

- B154. Gerard of Evington acknowledges that he took a half mark from Thomas le Gross, arrested and imprisoned for suspicion of theft, on condition that he dismiss him on bail until the coming of the justiciar, because he said that he was a farmer in this county. [Gerard says] that he took this as other sheriffs before him were accustomed to take from similar persons.
- B155. Convictum est quod Adam de la Staunpe et Ricardus le Marchaunt abstulerunt Willelmo le Neyr' quendam Harigaldum pretii xii (denariorum¹) quem ei adhuc detinent. Ideo predictus Adam presens est restituat eidem Willelmo predictum Harigaldum, vel pretium predictum. Et *custodiatur*¹⁷ pro transgressione. Et predictus Ricardus non venit, nec fuit attachiatus quia Willelmus non invenit plegios de proseguendo set sit in *misericordia*.¹⁸ Postea remittitur misericordia predictae Ade per finem quem Abbas de Certes' fecit pro se et aliis supra.
- B155. A jury determined that Adam de la Stampe and Richard le Merchant took a certain surcoat worth 12 pence from William le Neir which they still detain. Adam is present and he will restore the surcoat or its value to William. He is to be taken into *custody* for the transgression. Richard has not come nor was he attached since William did not find pledges for prosecuting, but he is *mercy*. Afterwards, Adam's amercement is remitted through the fine which the abbot of Chertsey made for him and the others named above.
- B156. Convictum est etiam quod Alexanderus serviens persone de Ledred' obstruxit quandam semitam inter Ledred' et Mikkellham ad nocumentum totius patrie. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod aperiri faciat semitam predictam per visum juratorum quantum fuerit ad nocumentum et ad custum etc. Et Alexanderus in *misericordia*.¹⁹
- B156. A jury also determined that Alexander, a serjeant of the parson of Leatherhead, obstructed a path between Leatherhead and Mickleham to the nuisance of the entire country. So the sheriff is ordered to open that path at [Alexander's] cost in as much as it was a nuisance. Alexander [is] in *mercy*.
- B157. Juratores presentant quod Simon persona de Ledred' attraxit sibi visum Franciplegii de hominibus suis eiusdem ville qui semper venire consueverunt ad visum predictum cum hominibus domini regis. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat eos de cetero ad faciendum predictum visum cum hominibus domini regis. Et Simon in *misericordia*.²⁰
- B157. The jurors present that Simon parson of Leatherhead appropriated to himself the view of frankpledge concerning his men from the vill, who were always accustomed to come to the view with the king's men. So the sheriff is ordered that henceforward he distrain them to make the view with the king's men. Simon [is] in *mercy*.
- B158. Rogerus serviens Johannis de Cherbyr' in Ledred' in *misericordia*.²¹ pro transgressione.
- B158. Roger serjeant of John of Cherburgh in Leatherhead [is] in *mercy* for a transgression.
- B159. Willelmus Page in *misericordia*.²² eo quod injuste cepit Willelmum Poynz et Walterum filium Laurencii et ipsos inprisonari faciat apud Guldef'.
- B159. William Page [is] in *mercy* because he unjustly seized William Ponz and Walter son of Laurence and imprisoned them at Guildford.

¹⁷Margin note by scribe, c. crossed out.

¹⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B160. Convictum est quod Gerardus de Evinton' dum fuit vicecomes cepit duos equos Simonis de Suthwell' per summonicionem scaccarii, et illos vendidit pro xii solidis que valebant xxii solidos et viii denarios. Et idem Simo voluit illos emisse pro predicto pretio, et Gerardus illos ei vendere recusavit. Ideo predictus Gerardus satisfaciat ei de x solidis et viii denariis. Et sit in *miser cordia*²³ pro transgressionem.

B160. A jury determined that Gerard of Evington, while he was sheriff, seized two of Simon of Southwell's horses, by means of a summons from the exchequer, and sold them for 12 shillings when they were worth 22 shillings and 8 pence. Simon wish to let them go at the aforesaid price and Gerard refused to sell them. So Gerard shall satisfy him of the 10 shillings and 8 pence. He is in *mercy* for the transgression.

B161. Juratores presentant quod Gerardus de Evynton' vicecomes cepit de Willelmo Bercario de Ledred' capta pro suspicione latrocinii dimidiam marcam per sic quod dimitteret ipsum per plevinam ut supra.

B161. The jurors present that Gerard of Evington the sheriff took a half mark from William Shepard of Leatherhead, arrested for suspicion of theft, on condition that he dismiss him on bail as above.

B162. Convictum est per juratam in quam Osbertus serviens Johannis de Chelesham et Petrus filius Jordani de eadem se posuerunt quod predicti Osbertus et Petrus vi recusserunt averia predicti Johannis de Chelesham de ballivo domini Regis postquam ea ceperat occasione cuiusdam debiti in quo predictus Johannes de Chelesham tenebatur domine Regine. Et quod predictus Osbertus verberavit predictum ballivum scilicet Petrum Justise et maletractavit. Ideo ambo *custodiatur*.²⁴ Post venerunt predicti Osbertus et Petrus et finem fecerunt per *i marcam*²⁵ per plegium Johannis de Chelesham.

B162. It is determined by the jury on which Osbert serjeant of John of Chelsham and Peter son of Jordan from the same place placed themselves that Osbert and Peter forcefully 'rescued' John of Chelsham's beasts from the king's bailiff after he had taken them on the occasion of a debt in which John of Chelsham was held to the queen. And [it is determined] that Osbert beat and maltreated the bailiff, namely Peter Justise. So they are both to be taken into *custody*. Afterwards, Osbert and Peter came and made fine for *1 mark* by pledge of John of Chelsham.

Hundredum de Brixton'

The Hundred of Brixton

B163.(T) Juratores presentant quod quadam die dominica scilicet in Crastino Animarum anno xxxvi venerunt quidam Walterus de Raghel', Phillipus de la Forest et Gwydo Peverel et quedam multitudo Pictavensium armatorum de familia Aymeri Electi Winton' et W. de Valencia et aliorum fratrum ipsius Electi apud Lambeth' ad Curiam Archiepiscopi Cant' ex missione (et preceptoⁱ) ipsius Electi, et ibidem ceperunt quendam Eustachium Officio predicti Archiepiscopi et quosdam Johannem Capellum, Adam Pistorem et Johannem le Bedel homines ipsius Archiepiscopi in domibus ipsius Archiepiscopi inventos ceperunt et hostia et fenestras earundem domorum fregerunt, et predictos Eustachium et alios a predictis domibus extraxerunt et abduxerunt usque Aldershet' ad domum cuiusdam Petri de Money et ibidem predictum Eustachium inprisonaverunt per duos dies et predictos Johannem Capellum [et alios] duxerunt usque Farnham et ipsos in Castro predicti Electi inprisonaverunt per quindecim dies. Et similiter predicti Walterus, Phillipus et alii in predictis domibus ipsius Archiepiscopi ceperunt (in roberiaⁱ) sexaginta (decemⁱ) solidos argenti et Ciphos argenti et alia jocalia asportaverunt et detinverunt quousque per complusionem ipsius Archiepiscopi ea

²³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²⁴Margin note by scribe, c. crossed out.

²⁵Margin note by scribe, i. m. crossed out.

restituerunt, preterea (il) predictos solidos lx decem quos adhuc detinent. Ideo inde loquendum etc.

B163.(T) The jurors present that on a Sunday, namely on the morrow of All Saints Day year 36 [2 November 1252], Walter of Ragnall, Philip de la Forest and Guy Peverel and a multitude of armed Poitevins, from the households of Aymer the Elect of Winchester, [William] de Valance and from the elects other brothers, on the order of the elect, came to Lambeth to the archbishop of Canterbury's court and there they seized, from the archbishop's residences, Eustace an official of the archbishop, John Chaplain, Adam Baker and John the Beadler, the archbishop's men. They destroyed the doors and windows of the houses and they dragged Eustace and the others from the houses and led them to Aldershot to Peter de Meon's house. There they imprisoned Eustace for two days and led John Chaplain [and the others] to Farnham and imprisoned them in the elect's castle for fifteen days. Walter and Philip and the others stole seventy shillings from the archbishop's houses and they carried off silver cups and other jewelry. They have withheld it, until by complusion on the part of the archbishop they have returned it. Moreover, () they still withhold the seventy shillings. So *it is to be discussed*.

B164.(T, a small cross) Juratores presentant quod Abbas de Becho de novo levavit furcas in Toting' set nesciunt quo waranto. Et similiter Prior de Merton' levavit furcas de novo in Merton set nesciunt quo waranto. Post venit Prior de Merton' et ostendit warantum. Post venit attornatum predicti Abbatis et non ostendit aliquod warantum. Ideo in *misericordia*.²⁶ Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat prosterni predictas furcas ad custum ipsius Abbatis.

B164.(T, a small cross) The jurors present that the abbot of Bec recently raised gallows in Tooting, but they do not know by what warrant. Likewise, the prior of Merton recently raised gallows at Merton, but they do not know by what warrant. Afterwards, the prior of Merton comes and shows the warrant. The abbot's attorney comes and does not show any warrant. So he [is] in *mercy*. The sheriff is ordered to knock down the gallows at the abbot's cost.

B165.(T) Presentatum est quod Prior de Bermundes' debet inundare et aperire quoddam fossatum apud Hasardesron'. Ita quod Rimilius de Winterburne habere possit cursum suum. Et cum prius aperire voluisset, impeditus fuit per quosdam servientes comitis Albemarl' set nesciunt qui fuerint. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod decetero distingat predictum Priorem ad (inundatidum⁵) et aperiendum fossatum predictum etc.

B165.(T) It is presented that the prior of Bermondsey ought to clear and open his ditch at Hasardestron so that Rimilius of Winterbourne is able to have his course. When he previously sought to open it he was impeded by the serjeants of the earl of Aumale, but by whom they do not know. So the sheriff is ordered that henceforward he distrain the prior to clear and open his ditch.

B166.(T) Juratores presentant quod villata de Sutlambeth' et de Stretham antiquitus solebant facere sectam ad Hundredum de Brixiston' de tribus septimanis in tres septimanas et similiter venire ad visum franciplegii in eodem hundredo et subtraxerunt se de primissis faciendis postquam Baldewinus de Insula habuit terram suam. Et similiter homines eiusdem Baldewini de Micham solebant facere predictam sectam et visum franci plegii in Hundredo de Walton' et subtraxerunt se eodem modo. Ideo ipsi in *misericordia*. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod distingat eos decetero ad faciendam predictam etc.

B166.(T) The jurors present that the vills of South Lambeth and Streatham, in former times, were accustomed to make suit to the hundred of Brixton every three weeks and likewise to come to view frankpledge in the hundred. They have withdrawn themselves from the former [suit] after Baldwin de Insula had his land. Likewise, Baldwin's men of Mitcham were accustomed to make suit and to view frankpledge in the hundred of Walton. They have withdrawn

²⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

themselves in the same way. So they [are] in *mercy*. The sheriff is ordered that henceforward he distrain them to make the aforesaid [suit].

[Membrane 8d.]

Adhuc de Hundredo de Brixiston'

Still Concerning the Hundred of Brixton

B167.(T) Homines Priores de Bermundes' de Dywewys et Legham queruntur de predicto Priore quod cum ipsi teneant tenementa sua in predictis villis que fuerunt de antiquo dominico domini Regis per ea(s)ⁱdem (consuetudine etⁱ) servicia quo ipsi et antecessores sui facere consueverunt temporibus predecessorum domini regis Regum Anglie, ac ipsi tallari non debeant nisi quando dominus Rex talliat dominica sua per Angliam, predictus Prior talliat ipsos de anno in annum pro voluntate sua unde dicunt quod deteriorati sunt et dampnum habent ad valenciam etc.

Et Prior venit. Et dicit quod omnes predecessores sui postquam feoffati fuerunt de predictis villis solebant eos tallire pro voluntate sua, et quod ipse quando constitutus fuit Prior de predicto Prioratu invenit predecessores suos et domum suam in seisin de predicto talliagio modo predicto. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictae ville de Dywewis et Legham fuerunt de antiquo dominico domini regis. Et dicunt quod homines de predictis maneriis non consueverunt talliari nec debent nisi quando dominus Rex talliat dominica sua per Angliam. Et ideo iniunctum est eidem Priori quod non talliat eos de cetero, nisi quando dominus Rex talliat dominica sua. Et Prior hoc idem concedit etc.

B167.(T) The prior of Bermondsey's men from Dwelly and Leigham complain against the aforesaid prior that whereas they hold their tenements in the villis which were the king's ancient demesne, by the same customs and services which they and their ancestors were accustomed to make during the times of previous kings of England, and moreover they ought not to be taxed except when the king taxes his demesne throughout England the prior [nevertheless] taxes them year in and year out at his own will. Wherefore, they say they have suffered damage to the value etc.

The prior comes. He says that all his predecessors after they were enfeoffed of the villis were accustomed to tax them at their own will. When he was made prior of the priory, he found his predecessors and his house in seisin of the tax in the aforesaid manner. On this he places himself on the country.

The jurors say that the vill of Dwelly and Leigham were the king's ancient demesne. They say that the men from those manors were not accustomed to be taxed, nor ought they, except when the king taxes his demesne throughout England. So it is enjoined to the prior that henceforward he not tax them, except when the king taxes his demesne. The prior grants this.

B168.(T) Homines de antiquo (dominico domini regisⁱ) de Walewurth' et Neweton' queruntur de Magistro Wilhelmo persona Ecclesie de Neweton' quod ipse dudum eos traxit in placitum in curia Christianitatis et frequenter imponendo eis plures injurias, et extorquendo ab eisdem bona sua, scilicet (abⁱ) aliquo ii marcas ab aliquo i marcam. Et postea cepit predictas villas ad firmam de Priore sancte Trinitatis Cantuar' ad (penitusⁱ) destruendum ipsos. Ita quod idem persona compulsi eos ad faciendum alias consuetudines quam [nunquam] facere consueverunt (et plures extorsiones cepit ab eis^{ul}) unde dicunt quod detriorati sunt et dampnum habent ad valenciam xx librarum etc.

Et Wilhelmus persona venit et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendit quod nunquam eos traxit in placitum nisi propter jura ecclesie sue, nec quod aliquid ab eis extorsit. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Juratores dicunt quod pluries traxit eos in placitum in curia Christianitatis et sepius extorsit (plura bonaⁱ) ab hominibus predictis de predictis villis que fuerunt de antiquo

dominico domini Regis. Et quesiti quas extorsiones et que dampna predicti homines (indeⁱ) habuerunt, dicunt quod ad valenciam x librarum. Ideo Consideratum est quod ipsi recuperent predicta dampna sua. Et Willelmus persona *custodiatur*.²⁷

B168.(T) The men of the king's ancient demesne of Walworth and Newington complain against Master William the parson of the church of Newington, that he recently pleaded them in court-Christian and frequently alleged against them various injuries and extorted their goods from them, namely from some 2 marks [and] from others 1 mark. Afterwards, he held the vill at farm from the prior of Saint Trinity Canterbury to completely ruin them. Thus, the parson forced them to make other customs which they were [never] accustomed to do. Wherefore, they say they have suffered damage to the value of 20 pounds.

William the parson comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that he never pleaded them except on the account of the rights of his church, nor did he extort anything from them. On this he places himself on the country.

The jurors say that numerous times William pleaded the men in court-Christian and often extorted many goods from the men of the vill, which were the king's ancient demesne. [The jurors were] asked what extortions and what damages the men had. They say that [the men suffered damage] to the value of 10 pounds. So it is adjudged that they shall recover their damages. William the parson is to be taken into *custody*.

Villata de Suthwerk'

The Vill of Southwark

B169. Convictum est per juratam in quam Michael Tovy custos pontis Lond' se posuit quod cum dominus Rex et omnes antecessores sui fuissent in seisin de quadam secta facienda ad curiam domini Regis de Suthwerk' pro quodam mesuagium quod fuit Osberti le Parment' quousque iam xii annis elapsis quando predictus custos subtraxit predictam sectam. Ideo consideratum est quod dominus Rex recuperet seisinam suam de predicta secta pro predicto mesuagio et predictus custos in *misericordia*.²⁸ Et satisfaciat pro arreragio etc. Convictum est (etiamⁱ) quod Magister Hospitali sancti Thome Martris de Ancon in Anglia eodem modo subtraxit quamdam sectam de eadem curia pro quodam mesuagio, iam sex annis elapsis. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus dominus Rex recuperet predictam sectam et Magister in *misericordia*.²⁹ et satisfaciat de arreragio, misericordia predicti custodi perdonatur per R. de Thurkelby etc. et similiter predicti Magisteri pro paupertate domus.

B169. It is determined by the jury on which Michael Tovy custodian of London Bridge placed himself that, whereas the king and all his ancestors were in seisin of suit to the king's court of Southwark for a certain messuage which was Osbert le Parmenter's until some 12 years ago, when the aforesaid custodian withdrew the suit. So it is adjudged that the king recovers his seisin of the suit for the messuage. The custodian [is] in *mercy*. He shall satisfy the king for the arrears. It is also determined that, in the same way some six years ago, the master of the Hospital of Saint Thomas the Martyr of Acon in England withdrew a certain suit to the same court for a certain messuage. So it is adjudged that the king recovers suit and the master [is] in *mercy*. He shall satisfy the king for the arrears. The custodian's amercement is pardoned by [Roger] de Thirkleby. Likewise the master's [amercement is pardoned] because of the poverty of the house.

B170. Juratores presentant quod Galfridus Norman cepit a quodam Willelmo de Bernewell' paupere dimidiam marcam pro quadam misericordia ad quam amerciatu fuit pro quadam defalta quam fecit coram eo ad turnum suum. Ideo *ad iudicium* de predicto Galfrido. Dicunt etiam quod predictus Galfridus cepit xxix solidos de quadam Katerina la Marberler', imponens ei quod Godefridus vir eius que profectus fuit in terram sanctam obiit et quod

²⁷Margin note by scribe, c. crossed out.

²⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

domus in qua predicta Katerina manebat debuit esse eschaeta regis cum predicta domus nullo modo potuit esse eschaete domini Regis eo quod plures sunt ibi heredes apparentes. Ideo in *miserecordia*.³⁰ Et satisfaciat predictae Katerine de predictis denariis.

Dicunt etiam quod idem Galfridus cepit de quodam Rogero Boyman de Comitatu Kant' unum quaterium frumenti pretii quatuor solidorum et sex denariorum et semper hucusque ei detinuit. Ita quod nec predictum bladum nec predictum pretium ei restituit. Et ideo respondeat de pretio, predicto Rogero. Et sit in *miserecordia*³¹ pro detentione.

B170. The jurors present that Geoffrey Norman took a half mark from William of Barnwell, a pauper, for an amercement for which he was amerced for default made before him at his tourn. So to *judgement* with Geoffrey. They also say that Geoffrey took 29 shillings from Katherine le Marberler, alleging that Godfrey, her husband who journeyed to the Holyland, had died and that the house in which she lived ought to be the king's escheat, when the house in no way could be the king's escheat because there are numerous heirs apparent. So he [is] in *mercy*. He shall satisfy Katherine of the money.

They also say that Geoffrey took one quarter of wheat, worth 4 shillings and six pence, from Roger Boyman from the county of Kent. Geoffrey still withholds it from him, nor has he restored the grain or its price. So he shall answer to Roger concerning the price. He is in *mercy* for detention.

B171. Juratores presentant quod idem Galfridus injuste cepit de Magerie que fuit uxor Galfridi de Winton' unam ollam ecream pretii iii solidorum. Ideo Consideratum est quod restituat ei predictos denarios. Et sit in *miserecordia*³² pro transgressione.

B171. The jurors present that Geoffrey unjustly took one [?gold] pot worth 3 shillings from Marjery who was the wife of Geoffrey of Winchester. So it is adjudged that he shall restore the money to her. He is in *mercy* for the transgression.

B172. Galfridus le Teynturer in *miserecordia*³³ pro transgressione.

B172. Geoffrey le Dyer [is] in *mercy* for a transgression.

B173.(T) Willelmus Pravus' queritur de predicto Galfrido Norman quod abstulit ab eo duos bussellos siliginis et ipsum postea inprisonavit et in priona detinuit quousque predictus Willelmus finem fecit cum predicto Galfrido per duos solidos, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam etc.

Et Galfridus venit et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et dicit quod consuetudo ville de Suthwerk' talis est quod nullus vendat nec emat bladum in foro de Suthwerk' antequam missa matutinalis cantetur apud Hospitium sancti Thome de Suthwerk'. Et dicit quod predictus Willelmus est regratorius et quia ipse emit unum quaterium (siligini¹) antequam missa ibidem cantata fuit, cepit ipse predictos (duos¹) bussellos siliginis (et ii solidos¹) pro *miserecordia* sua pro predicta transgressione. Et juratores hoc idem testatur, set quia *miserecordia* nimis gravis fuit, ideo restituat ei predictos duos Bussellos siliginis et retineat predictos duos solidos pro *miserecordia*. Et ipse similiter in *miserecordia*³⁴ pro transgressione.

B173.(T) William Preaux complains against Geoffrey Norman that he took two bushels of rye from him and then imprisoned him and detained him in prison until William made fine with Geoffrey for two shillings. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value etc.

Geoffrey comes and denys force and injury. He says that the custom of Southwark is such that no one shall sell nor buy grain in Southwark market before matins mass is sung at

³⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

the Hospital of Saint Thomas of Southwark. He says that William is a regrater, and since he bought one quarter of rye before mass was sung, he took the two bushels and 2 shillings from him for his amercement. The jurors testify to this. But since the amercement was too grave, so Geoffrey shall restore the two bushels of rye to him and retain the two shillings for the amercement. Likewise, he [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

- B174. Tota communitas ville de Suthwerk' queritur de Edwardo filio domini Regis primogenito, quod cum nulla libertatem hospiciorum unquam fieri solebat, nec capi ab aliquo contra voluntatem hominum de Suthwerk' nisi per dominum Regem, predictus Edwardus capit hospicia sua et facit liberacionem suam pro voluntate sua et contra voluntatem hominum predictorum. Et similiter capit prisas suas infra predictam villam de Suthwerk' de carnibus, piscibus et aliis rebus ubi nunquam capi solebat, nisi per dominum Regem. Ideo inde *loquendum*.
- B174. The entire vill of Southwark complains against Edward the king's first born son that whereas no liberty of lodging was ever customary nor [was it] taken from any man from Southwark against his will, except by the king, Edward takes lodging and made his liberty at his own will against the men's will. Likewise, he takes his prize of flesh, fish and other things from within the vill of Southwark, whereas it was never customarily taken, except by the king. So *it is to be discussed*.
- B175. Juratores presentant quod Galfridus Norman dum fuit ballivus de Suthwerk' semper percepit misericordias de pistoribus et Braciatribus pro emendas assise panis et cervisie non servate et nunquam iudicium inde fieri permisit de eisdem nec fieri fecit. Ideo ipse in *miser cordia*.³⁵
- B175. The jurors present that Geoffrey Norman, while he was the bailiff of Southwark, always collected amercements from bakers and brewers for fines to the assize of bread and ale and he never allowed justice to be done concerning the same nor did he cause it to be done. So he [is] in *mercy*.
- B176. Ricardus Testard' queritur de predicto Galfrido quod cepit ab eo duas marcas ad quas amerciatus fuit per summonicionem scacarii dum idem Galfridus fuit ballivus Willelmi de Suthedever, et modo distructus est per vicecomitem pro eisdem duabus marcatas. --- Et Galfridus venit et bene cognovit quod recepit predictas duas marcas, set dicit quod eas cepit tamquam serviens predicti Willelmi et ei inde respondit. Et ideo Consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus acquietare predictum Ricardum de predictis denariis. (Et sit in *miser cordia*³⁶ quam prius etc.¹) Et quia predictus Willelmus nullam terram habet in comitatu isto. Et testatum est quod habet ad sufficientem in comitatu *Suthi'* ideo preceptum est vicecomiti Suthi' quod distringat predictum Willelmum ad satisfactionem predictam.
- B176. Richard Testard complains that while the aforesaid Geoffrey [Norman] was William of Southdever's bailiff, Geoffrey took two marks from him for [an amercement] for which he was amerced by means of the summons from the exchequer. He [Richard] is now distrained by the sheriff for the same two marks. --- Geoffrey comes and readily acknowledges that he received two marks, but he says that he took these as William's serjeant and he answered to him. So it is adjudged that William acquit Richard of the money. He is in *mercy* as before. Since William has no land in this county and it is testified that he has sufficient in the county of *Southampton*, so the sheriff of Southampton is ordered to distrain William to satisfy the aforesaid.
- B177. Memorandum quod Johannes de Tycheseye, Reginaldus de Brentinghurst, Henricus de Dyllewy, Johannes Erminer, Manserius de Wabandur' et Robertus de Cruce manuceperunt habendi Stephanum de Pecham clericum coram Justiciario Anglie ad mandatum ipsius etc.

³⁵Margin note by scribe, *mia'* crossed out.

³⁶Margin note by scribe, *mia'* crossed out.

- B177. Memorandum that John of Titsey, Reginald of Briddinghurst, Henry of Dwelly, John Erminer, Manser of Wabandur' and Robert de Cruce undertake to have Stephen of Peckham a clerk before the justiciar of England at his order.
- B178. Convictum est quod predictus Galfridus Norman cepit quendam Johannem filium Thome de Comitatu Oxon' imponens ei ipsum esse latronem et eum inprisonat per quindecim dies, et postea permisit ipsum abire. Et ideo et pro aliis injuriis predictis committatur *gaole*.³⁷
- B178. A jury determined that Geoffrey Norman seized John son of Thomas from the county of Oxfordshire alleging him to be a thief. He imprisoned him for fifteen days. Afterwards he allowed him to go. So for this and other injuries he is to be committed to *gaol*.
- B179.(Surr') Memorandum quod Johannes de Wauton' remaneat eschaetor in isto comitatu. Et Ricardus Testard qui prius fuit eschaetor amotus est etc.
- B179.(Surrey) Memorandum that John of Walton shall remain the escheator in this county. Richard Testard who was the previous escheator is removed.
- B180.(Salop') Radulfus de Dungun ponit loco suo Robertum de Ludham vel Magisterum Hugonem de Insula versus Abbatem Salop' de placito detentionis redditus etc.
- B180.(Shrewsbury) Ralph Dungun appoints as his attorneys Robert of Lowdham or Master Hugh de Insula against the abbot of Shrewsbury in a plea of withholding rent.

[Membrane 9]

Hundredum De Waleton' De Querelis

The Hundred of Wallington Concerning Complaints

- B181.(T) Convictum est per juratam in quam Radulfus de Plukel' se posuit quod predictus Radulfus post mortem cuiusdam Odonis liber tenentarius sui asportavit noctanter de Blado in terra que fuit ipsius Odonis existente circater duo quateria ordinari et quinque quateria avene. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Radulfus satisfaciatur Matilda que fuit uxor predicti Odonis executori eiusdem que modo sequitur de pretio predicti bladi scilicet de xi solidis. Et Radulfus in *misericordia*.³⁸ Convictum est etiam quod predictus Radulfus cepit averia cuiusdam Johannis Juliene et ea inparcavit et tenuit in parco quousque predictus Johannes invenit ei plegios veniendi ad Curiam ipsius Radulfi ad standum ibi recto ad ea que idem Radulfus ei vellet obicere. Et postquam invenerat sufficientes plegios ad hoc faciendo predictus Radulfus nichilominus retinuit averia predicta. Ita quod predictus Johannes ivit pro ballivo domini Regis ad deliberanda predicta averia. Et predictus Radulfus quamcito hoc percepit fugavit predicta averia extra parcum suum preter unum equum quem verberavit. Ita quod vix convaluit. Ideo predictus Radulfus pro transgressionibus in *misericordia*.³⁹ Convictum est etiam quod predictus Radulfus obstruxit quandam semitam in Watindon'. Ideo consideratum est quod predicta semita aperiatur per visum etc. Et ad Custum etc. Et Radulfus in *misericordia*.⁴⁰
- B181.(T) It is determined by the jury on which Ralph of Pluckley placed himself that Ralph, after the death of Odo, his free tenant, carried off Odo's grain by night, [namely] about two quarters of barley and five quarters of oats. So it is adjudged that Ralph shall satisfy Matilda, Odo's widow, [and] his executor who now sues concerning the value of the grain, namely 11 shillings. Ralph [is] in *mercy*. It is also determined that Ralph seized John Juliene's beasts

³⁷Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

³⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

and impounded them and held them imparked until John found pledges to come to Ralph's court to stand to right there for those things which Ralph wished to raise against him. After he found sufficient pledges for this, Ralph nevertheless retained the beasts. Thus, John went to get the king's bailiff to deliver the beasts. Ralph as soon as he learned of this, drove the beasts outside his park, except one horse which he beat so that it barely recovered. So Ralph [is] in *mercy* for these transgressions. It is also determined that Ralph obstructed a path in Wallington. So it is adjudged that the path is to be opened at [Ralph's] cost. Ralph [is] in *mercy*.

B182. Juratores presentant quod Galfridus de Lesuman et Willelmus de Bussy senescallus suos distrixerunt libere tenentes de Waleton' pro talliagio predicto Galfrido faciendo imponens eis quod essent de dominico domini Regis et districtionem illam aggravando semper continuaverunt quousque predicti homines finem fecerunt per xiii marcis antequam pacem habere possent. Dicunt etiam quod predictus Galfridus fecit extendere manerium de Waletone' per predictum Willelmum ad duplum valoris eiusdem manerii, et postmodum per vim suam commisit manerium illud cuidam Willelmo le Curt ad respondendum de extensione predicta. Ita quod ultra valorem predicti manerii extorsit ab eo per vim suam xii^{cim} marcas et tres solidos semel et interim cepit de Petro la Chuvaler ii marcas et vii solidos que prius reddidit Johanni de Elington' servienti suo. Dicunt etiam quod Johannes de Elington' ballivus predicti Galfridi injuste extorsit a quodam Willelmo Danastre libero homine de Waleton' semel Tres solidos et quatuor denarios eo quod noluit finem facere similiter cum aliis tenentibus eiusdem manerii, nec participare cum eis de quodam fine x^{cem} marcas quam fecerunt cum predicto Galfrido pro pace habenda ne indebite talliarentur. Et interim ea occasione cepit ipse Tres solidos et octo denarios de eodem Willelmo. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

B182.(T) The jurors present that Geoffrey de Lusignan and William de Bussey, his seneschal, distrained the free tenants of Wallington to pay a tallage to Geoffrey, alleging that they were from the king's demesne. This distraint he has always continued to increase, until the men made fine for 13 marks to have the peace. They also say that Geoffrey had the manor of Wallington extended by William at double the manor's value, and later by force he committed that manor to William le Curt to answer for the extent. Thus, he extorted the extra amount from him by force, [namely] 12 marks and three shillings. Meanwhile, he took 2 marks and 7 shillings from Peter le Chuvaler, which [amount] Peter had previously rendered to John of Ellington, Geoffrey's serjeant. They also say that John of Ellington, Geoffrey's bailiff, unjustly extorted nearly three shillings and four pence from William Danastre, a free tenant of Wallington, because he did not make fine along with the other tenants of the manor, nor did he participate with them in a fine of 10 marks which they made to Geoffrey in order to have the peace so they would not be unduly tallaged. Meanwhile, on the same occasion he took three shillings and eight pence from the same William. So *it is to be discussed*.

B183.(T, loquendum cum Rege) Radulfus de Imewurth' queritur de Roberto Agylun quod (cumⁱ) idem Robertus iam decem annis elapsis perquisierit warennam in omnibus dominicis terris suis in Walton', Adynton' et Pertinges, volens warrenare terras ipsius Radulfi in Adynton' que non sunt de feodo ipsius Roberti capere fecit ducentes oves ipsius Radulfi extra feodum suum et eas inparcare fecit in curia sua de Adynton' et detinuit per quinque dies quousque ballivus domini Regis illius hundredi venit ad deliberandum illas et tunc predictus Robertus eas fugari fecit extra parcum suum, ita tantum quod tres ex illis ob illam imparcacionem illa vice moriebantur. Et postmodo idem Robertus alia vice capere fecit predictas decentes oves exceptis tribus mortuis in feodo ipsius Radulfi et extra feodum suum et interim inparcare in curia sua predicta et eas ibidem detinuit per octo dies quousque predictus ballivus domini regis venit ad deliberandum eas et tunc fecit predictus Robertus eas inde fugari ut prius. Ita tantum quod decem ex illis statim post moriebantur. Et postea fecit predictus Robertus capere quinquaginta oves cuiusdam Johannis Scon propositi ipsius Radulfi in regia strata in Adynton' et illas fugari extra hundredum de Waleton' usque Waldingham in Hundredo de Tenrig' et eas ibidem detinuit per tres septimanas quousque predictus Radulfus finem fecit cum predicto Roberto per quendam Austurcum mutarium quem idem Radulfus ei dedit et similiter per tres solidos quos predictus propositus dedit eidem Roberto. Queritur etiam quod

predictus Robertus postea misit quosdam servientes suos noctanter ad domum ipsius Radulfi in Adinton' ad verberandum ipsum et idem Radulfus inde premunitus in oculo exivit a domo sua et per medium gardini sui evasit usque domum Godefridi de Benthesham in Benthesham, ob quod idem Robertus amovit warnarum suum de eadem villa imponens ei quod predictus premunitus fuit per ipsum. Et postmodo idem Robertus misit servientes suos ad terram predicti Radulfi in Adynton' et verberari fecit (Bercarium¹) Carucarium eiusdem Radulfi et maletractarent et Carucam iniunctam ipsius Radulfi capi fecit et detineri per magnum tempus, per quod amisit warnagium suum, et ita quod predictus Radulfus per gravem verberaturam hominum suorum, neminem postea invenire potuit qui sequi voluit carucam suam. Ita quod pro defectum Carucariorum fecit idem Radulfus per quoddam tempus excolere terram suam per mulieres sequentes carucam suam. Et similiter pluries vexari fecit homines et tenentes eiusdem Radulfi de predicta villa. Ita quod tenentes predicti accesserunt ad predictum Radulfum, supplicando ut aliquo modo componeret cum predicto Roberto, quod ipsi possent pacem habere de huiusmodi vixacionibus (vel quod opteneret eos relinquere tenementa sua¹) et idem Radulfus ob predictas vexaciones composuit cum eodem Roberto et confecit ei quoddam scriptum de warennam habenda in terris ipsius Radulfi et Alianore uxoris sue in villa de Adington'. Et quod (istas et¹) plures alia injurias ei fecit occasione predicta, petit quod inquiratur. Et dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl^a librarum etc.

Et Robertus venit. Et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendit quod predictus Radulfus nunquam per aliquam complusionem ipsius Roberti confecit ei aliquod scriptum vel cartam de warennam habenda in terris suis. Dicit enim quod iidem Radulfus et Alienora uxor eius ex mera voluntate sua ei confecerunt cartam suam de warennam habenda in terris suis de Adington'. Ita cum quod liceat eisdem Radulfo et Alianore et eorum heredem fugare in eisdem pro voluntate sua excepta quadam Bruera in eadem villa in qua non licebit ipsis fugare nec lepores vel aliquod quod ad warennam pertineat capere nisi proportionaliter quantum idem Robertus et heredes sui capient in eadem bruera. Et profert cartam ipsorum Radulfi et Alianore que hoc idem testatur. Et quod ipse Robertus predictas oves cepit nec capere fecit ne in aliud hundredo fugari nec etiam homines ipsius Radulfi verberari fecit nec quod ad ipsum Radulfum verberandum misit servientes suos ponit se super patriam.

Juratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod revera predictus Robertus postquam perquisierat cartam domini Regis de warennam habenda in dominicis terris suis in Adington' et aliis villis misit ipse pluries predicto Radulfo quod concederet ei warennam habere in terris ipsius Radulfi in Adington' et quia idem Radulfus hoc ei concedere recusavit distrinxit predictus Robertus predictum Radulfum et tenentes suos et frequentes vexaciones eis fecit et fieri precepit. Ita quod predictus Radulfus tractavit (^{il}) cum predicto Roberto de pace reformanda, et ei promisit quinque marcas argenti et duos solidos annui redditus in villa de Adington' quos idem Robertus recipere recusavit. Ita quod predictus Radulfus nullo modo componere potuit cum predicto Roberto nisi ei concedere vellet habendi warennam in terris suis sicut predictum est, unde dicunt quod predictus Robertus fecit predicto Radulfo et fieri precepit eidem Radulfo et hominibus suis omnes predictas distrusiones et transgressionem ita quod per complusionem confecit eidem Roberto predictum scriptum. Et juratores quesiti que dampna predictus Radulfus habuit occasione predictarum vexacionum sui et hominum suorum dicit quod ad valenciam xx librarum. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Radulfus recuperet predicta dampna xx (libras^c) (marcasⁱ). Et Robertus Agyllun *custodiatur*.⁴¹ Sciendum quod scriptum remanet penes justiciarium. Et inde *loquendum* etc. *V. marcas Totum clericis.*

B183.(T, to be discussed with the king) Ralph of Imworth complains against Robert Aguillon that, whereas Robert some ten years ago acquired a warren on all his demesne lands in Wallington, Addington and Pertinges, he sought to warren Ralph's lands in Addington which were not from Robert's fee. He seized twenty of Ralph's sheep outside his fee and impounded them for fifteen days until the king's bailiff of that hundred came to free them. When Robert drove them outside his park three of those impounded were dead. Afterwards, on another occasion Robert seized the twenty sheep, less the three dead ones, from Ralph's fee outside

⁴¹Margin note by scribe, c. crossed out.

his own fee and impounded them in his court and detained them for eight days until the king's bailiff came to free them. Robert drove them as before [and] soon afterwards ten of those died. Afterwards, from the royal way Robert seized fifty sheep from John Scon, Ralph's steward, and he drove them outside the hundred of Wallington to Woldingham in the hundred of Tandridge. There he detained them for three weeks until Ralph made fine with Robert for a mewed goshawk which he gave to Robert and likewise [for] three shillings which the steward gave to Robert. He also complains that Robert sent certain of his serjeants by night to Ralph's house in Addington to beat him. Ralph, forewarned [of this assault], left his house unseen and escaped through his garden to the home of Godfrey of Bensham in Bensham, on account of which [act] Robert removed Godfrey's plough-team from the vill alleging that the warning had come from him. Afterwards, Robert sent his serjeants to Ralph's land in Addington and they beat and maltreated Ralph's shepard and ordered Ralph's plough to be seized and detained it for a long time. As a result, he lost his plough-team. Thus, Ralph, as a result of the severe beating to his men, was unable to find anyone to follow his plough. Thus, through the lack of ploughmen, Ralph for some time plowed his land with women following his plough. Likewise, many of Ralph's tenants from the vill were harassed. Thus the tenants came to Ralph pleading with him to settle with Robert so that they could have the peace from all these harassments or else they would have to give up their tenements. Ralph, as a result of the harassments, settled with Robert and he made a deed of warrenage for his and his wife Eleanor's lands in Addington. That Robert caused these and other injuries on that occasion, he seeks that this be examined into. He says he has suffered damage to the value of 40 pounds.

Robert comes and denies force and injury. He readily maintains that Ralph was never forced by him to confer any deed or charter of warren to him. He says that Ralph and Eleanor of their own good will conferred their charter of warren concerning their lands in Addington to him. Thus, he allowed Ralph and Eleanor and their heirs to hunt in the same at his will, except in a heath in the vill in which they are not allowed to hunt either the hares or anything else which pertains to the warren, excepting a proportional amount which Robert and his heirs take from the heath. He produced Ralph and Eleanor's charter in which this is testified. That he neither seized the sheep nor caused them to be seized nor drove them to another hundred nor that he beat Ralph's men nor sent his serjeants to beat Ralph on this he places himself on the country.

The jurors say upon their oath that Robert acquired a royal charter of warren for his demesne lands in Addington and in the other villis. He sent several [requests] to Ralph to grant him warren on Ralph's lands in Addington. Since Ralph refused to grant this to him Robert distrained Ralph and his tenants and he ordered frequent harassments to be carried out against them. Thus, Ralph was led to ([settle]) with Ralph to restore the peace. Ralph promised Robert five silver marks and two shillings yearly rent in the vill of Addington which Robert refused. Thus, Ralph was in no way able to settle with Robert, unless he wished to grant him the warren on his land, as is stated. Wherefore, they say that Robert ordered the aforesaid attacks and transgressions to be carried out against Ralph and his men. Thus, Ralph was forced to grant Robert the deed. The jurors were asked what damages Ralph had on the occasion of the harassments against him. They say [he suffered damage] to the value of 20 pounds. So it is adjudged that Ralph recovers his damages at 20 marks. Robert Aguillon is to be taken into *custody*. Let it be known that the deed shall remain in the justiciar's possession. *5 marks, all to the clerks.*

B184.(Tenrig') Galfridus de Novo Castro in Axsted' in *misericordia*⁴² pro falso clamore versus Johannem de Staingrave.

B184.(Tandridge) Geoffrey of New Castle in Oxted [is] in *mercy* for false claim against John of Stangrove.

B185. Idem Robertus Agillon queritur de predicto Radulfo et similiter de Ricardo clerico, Johanne le Scon et Willelmo le Neuman quod predicti Ricardus et alii ex precepto predicti

⁴²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Radulfi insultum fecerunt in quendam Ricardum le Warn' et Willelmum propositum homines ipsius Roberti, et ipsos vulneraverunt et utrique ipsorum unam Costam fregerunt et tres dentes (gule¹) ipsius Willelmi fregerunt et ipsos male verberaverunt et maletractaverunt contra pacem etc. unde dicit quod deterioratus est etc. ad valenciam xx librarum.

Idem Robertus similiter queritur de predicto Radulfo quod predictus Ricardus clericus ex precepto ipsius Radulfi quendam Johannem Bercarium ipsius Roberti verberavit, vulneravit et maletractavit ita quod reliquit ipsum semivivum contra pacem etc. Et Radulfus venit. Et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendit quod predicti Ricardus et alii nunquam ex precepto suo in ipsos insultum fecerunt nec eos verberaverunt, vulneraverunt nec maletractaverunt nec aliquam injuriam eis ex precepto suo fecerunt. Et quod ita sit ponit se super patriam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera predicti Ricardus et alii verberaverunt predictos Ricardum le Warn' et alios homines ipsius Roberti et maletractaverunt, set non ex precepto ipsius Radulfi. Et ideo predictus Radulfus inde sine die. Et Robertus in *misericordia*⁴³ pro falso clamore. Et predicti Ricardus clericus et alii *capiantur*⁴⁴ pro transgressione.

B185. Robert Aguillon complains against the aforesaid Ralph and likewise [against] Richard clerk, John le Scon and William le Newman. [He says] that Richard and the others, on Ralph's order, insulted and beat Richard le Warrener and William steward, Robert's men, [thus] each have a broken rib and William had three front teeth knocked out and they badly beat and maltreated them against the peace. Wherefore, he says he suffered damage to the value of 20 pounds.

Robert likewise complains of Ralph that Richard clerk, on Ralph's order, beat wounded and maltreated John, Robert's shepherd, so he was left half alive. Ralph comes. He denys force and injury. He readily maintains that Richard and the others neither insulted them on his order nor did they beat, wound or maltreat [them] nor did they carry out any injury to them on his order. On this he places himself on the country.

The jurors say that Richard and the others beat and maltreated Richard le Warrener and Robert's other men, but not on Ralph's order. So Ralph is without a day. Robert [is] in *mercy* for false claim. Richard clerk and the others are to be *arrested* for the transgression.

[Membrane 9d.]

Villata de Suwerk'

The Vill of Southwark

B186.(T) Davidus de Jarpenvill' vicecomes Surr' et ballivi domini regis de Suwerk' et ballivi Comitis Warenn' queruntur de Johanne Adrian et Roberto Cornhull' vicecomitibus Lond' et ballivis ipsorum quod ubi vicecomes et ballivi domini regis de Suwerk' et ballivi predicti Comitis usque iam tribus annis elapsis semper in seisina extitissent capiendi de quolibet summagio piscis (transeuntis⁵) per burgum de Suwerk' unum piscem, utrum esset de libertate vel non. Et de quolibet equo (cartato¹) unum obulum, nisi esset de libertate nomine theolinei ad opus domini regis et predicti Comitis et ubi nullus de villata de Suwerk' distringi debent per ballivos London' veniendi in Lond' responsurus aliis de eis conquerentibus. Et similiter ubi ad ipsos ballivos de Suwerk' pertinet capere consuetudinem Kayagii ad ripam sancti Olaphi in Suwerk' de navibus et batellis ibidem applicantibus predicti Johannes et Robertus de Cornhull' vicecomites Lond' et ballivi ipsorum ultra pontem turneicum in medio ponitis versus Suwerk' et in burgo de Suwerk' capiunt predictum theoloneum piscis et oboli de equis cartatis et distringunt homines de Suwerk' veniendi infra Lond' aliis responsuros et similiter capiunt consuetudinem kayagii ad ripam sancti Olaphi in Suwerk' de navibus et batellis ibidem applicantibus. Et similiter ubi a filo aque Tamisie versus Suwerk' et circa pontem turneicum ad ipsos ballivos de Suwerk' pertinet facere omnes districtiones de jure faciendas. Idem vicecomites Lond' et ballivi ipsorum ultra filum predicte aque, et ultra predictum

⁴³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴⁴Margin note by scribe, cap. crossed out.

pontem turneicium, faciant districtiones suas de quibus ballivi domini regis de Suwerk', usque iam tribus annis elapsis fuerunt in seisinā nomine regis, unde dicunt quod dominus rex et predictus Comes dampnum habent ad valenciam centum librarum.

Et Johannes Adrian et Robertus de Cornhull' vicecomites Lond' veniunt et dicunt quod non debent de aliquo respondere extra Civitatem Lond'. Et similiter dicunt quod de predictis theoloneis et districtionibus non possunt respondere sine maiore et communitate Lond', ideo veniunt crastino. Postea veniant predicti vicecomites et quamplures Cives de Lond' et dicunt quod non debent respondere extra Civitatem Lond' de aliquo quod ad predictam civitatem pertinet et dicunt quod totus pons usque (adⁱ) stapellos ad capud pontis in Suwerk' pertinet ad civitatem Lond' et similiter totus cursus Tamisie, ab uno kayo usque ad aliud kayun, in Suwerk' pertinet ad predictam civitatem et de theoloneis in predicta aqua captis vel infra predictos stapellos vel districtionibus infra predictos stapellos vel in predicta aqua factis non debent extra predictam civitatem respondere.

Postea quia vicecomes et ballivi domini regis de Suwerk' dicunt quod dominus rex usque iam tribus annis elapsis fuit in seisinā de capiēdo theoloneum de quolibet equo cartato, et de summagio piscis, et predicti vicecomites Lond' et ballivi ipsorum ultra predictos stapellos intrant infra villam de Suwerk' et ibi capiunt predictum theolonium de equis cartatis et de summagio piscis. Et similiter dicunt quod dominus rex fuit in seisinā de capiēdo consuetudinem kayagii ad ripam sancti Olaphi in Suwerk' de navibus et batellis ibidem applicantibus; consideratum est quod inquiratur de seisinā domini regis et quod predicti vicecomites respondeant de transgressione sua. Et de predictis distrinctionibus factis ultra pontem Turneicium usque ad stapellos et utrum pars pontis a ponte Turneicio versus Suwerk' et similiter utrum medietas aque Tamisie scilicet a filo predictae aque pertineat ad Comitatum de Surreye, vel non, ponuntur in respectum quousque *loquendum* fuerit *cum domino rege* et eius consilio.

Et predicti vicecomites bene defendunt pro se et ballivis ipsorum quod ipsi nunquam intraverunt villam de Suwerk' ultra stapellos ad capud pontis pro aliquo theolonio capiēdo de equis cartatis vel summagio piscis. Et de capcione consuetudinis kaiagii ad ripam Sancti Olaphi bene defendunt quod ipsi-----nunquam aliquam consuetudinem de Kayagio ibidem ceperunt. Et de hoc ponunt se super patriam.

Et iuratores ad hoc electi-----dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predicti vicecomites et eorum ballivi non intraverunt predictam villam de Suwerk', ultra stapellos ad capud pontis pro aliquo theolone capiēdo, vel de equo vel de summagio piscis. Dicunt etiam quod dominus rex nec ballivi de Suwerk' unquam aliquam habuerunt seisinā de capiēdo aliquam consuetudinem Kayagii ad ripam sancti Olaphi. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti vicecomites inde sine die.

B186.(T) David of Jarpenvill sheriff of Surrey, the king's bailiffs of Southwark and the bailiffs of the earl Warenne complain against John Adrian and Robert Cornhill, sheriffs of London, and their bailiffs that, whereas the sheriff, the king's bailiffs of Southwark and the earl's bailiffs, until some three years ago, had always stood in seisin collecting as a toll for the benefit of the king and the earl one fish from each pack-load of fish transported through the borough of Southwark whether it was from the liberty or not, and a half penny from each horse-load unless it was from the liberty, and whereas no one from Southwark ought to be distrained by the bailiffs of London to come to London to answer others who complain against them and likewise whereas the bailiffs of Southwark have the right to collect wharfage-fees at the estuary of Saint Olaf's in Southwark from ships and boats mooring there, John Adrian and Robert Cornhill, sheriffs of London, and their bailiffs have collected the toll of fish and the half-penny from horse-load beyond the drawbridge in the middle of the bridge crossing towards Southwark and in the borough of Southwark and they have distrained the men of Southwark to come within London to answer others. Likewise, they have collected wharfage-fees at the estuary of Saint Olaf in Southwark from ships and boats mooring there. Likewise, whereas the bailiffs of Southwark have the right to make all distrains from midstream of the Thames across to Southwark and around the drawbridge, the sheriffs of London and their bailiffs made the distrains beyond midstream and beyond the drawbridge, of which [rights] the king's bailiffs stood in seisin, in the king's name, until three years ago. Wherefore, they say that the king and the earl have suffered damage to the value of one hundred pounds.

John Adrian and Robert Cornhill, sheriffs of London, come and say that they ought not to answer for anything outside the City of London. Likewise, they say that they are not able to answer for the tolls and distrains without the mayor and community of London, so they are to come on the morrow. Afterwards, the sheriffs and many citizens of London came and they said that they ought not to answer outside the City of London for anything which pertains to the city. They say that the whole bridge up to the Stuples at the head of the bridge in Southwark pertains to the City of London, likewise the whole course of the Thames from one quay to the other quay in Southwark pertains to the city and concerning the tolls taken on the water or within the Stuples or distrains within the Stuples or on the river they ought not to answer outside the city.

Afterwards, since the sheriffs and the king's bailiffs of Southwark say that the king, until some three years ago, was in seisin of the toll collected from each horse-load and pack-load of fish, and the sheriffs of London and their bailiffs entered the vill of Southwark beyond the Stuples and there they took the toll from horse-loads and from pack-loads of fish, and likewise [whereas] they say that the king was in seisin of the right to collect wharfage-fees at the estuary of Saint Olaf in Southwark from ships and boats mooring there, it is adjudged that the king's seisin is to be examined into and the sheriffs shall answer for their transgression. Concerning the distrains made beyond the drawbridge up to the Stuples and whether part of the bridge from the drawbridge across to Southwark as well as whether half of the Thames, namely from midstream, belongs to the county of Surrey or not, [these matters] are placed in respite until it has been *discussed with the king* and his council.

The sheriffs, for themselves and their bailiffs, readily maintain that they never entered the vill of Southwark beyond the Stuples at the head of the bridge to collect any toll on horse-loads or pack-loads of fish. Concerning the right to collect the wharfage-fees at the estuary of Saint Olaf, they readily maintain they-----never took any wharfage-fees from there. On this they place themselves on the country. The jurors elected for this-----say upon their oath that the sheriffs and their bailiffs have not entered the vill of Southwark beyond the Stuples at the head of the bridge to collect any toll on horse-loads or pack-loads of fish. They also say that neither the king nor the bailiffs of Southwark ever had seisin of wharfage at the estuary of Saint Olaf. So it is adjudged that the sheriffs are without a day.

B187.(Ebor', T) Convenit inter Willelmum de Lassel' ex una parte et Ricardum filium Martini de Oteringham ex altera de eo quod predictus Willelmus questus fuit quod cum predictus Ricardus ipsum acquietasse debuit ad festum sancti Hyllarii anno xlii de ducentis libris versus Haginum judeum Linc' et centum et novem libris versus Salomonem judeum London' et pro aure Regine pro quibusdam terris et tenementis de quibus idem Willelmus ipsum Ricardum feofaverat scilicet pro pasturis de Norhtgundermareys et Middelgundermareys et viginti solidatis redditus cum pertinenciis in Oteringham; idem Ricardus ipsum non acquietavit et similiter quod predictus Ricardus ultra predictos mariscos et redditum occupavit et attraxit sibi quasdam partes aliarum terrarum et tenementorum suorum. (Et unde placitus fuit etc.ⁱ) scilicet quod predictus Willelmus (recognovit ^{ul}) et concessit pro se et heredibus suis quod predicti marisci et redditus extendantur et apprecientur per Johannem de Frithmareys, Johannem de Danthrop', Willelmum de la Tuere, Bernardum Dareyngnes, Stephanum de Hethfeud, Willelmum de Wynetone, Willelmum de Hoyton', Arnoldum de Oteringham, Stephanum de Brustwyk', Thomam de Wyneton', Alanum de Sauz et Stephanum de Camerington'. Et quod quelibet duodecim denariate terre et redditus et pasture allocentur predicto Ricardo (et heredibus suisⁱ) pro una marca usque Trescentes et novem libras argenti. Et si predictae pasture et redditus per predictam extensionem ad predictas Trescentes et novem libras non sufficiant, tunc id quod defuerit per eandem extensionem perficietur eidem Ricardo et heredibus suis (de omnibus terrisⁱ) et tenementis ipsius Willelmi de feodo Comitibus Albemarl' in eandem villa usque ad predictam summam scilicet de remotioribus terris a capitali messuagio ipsius Willelmi in eandem villa et propinquioribus messuagio ipsius Ricardi quousque plena extensio facta fuit ad predictas trescentas et novem libras argenti. Et si terre ipsius Willelmi de feodo predicti Comitibus ad hoc non sufficiant, tunc id quod defuerit perficietur in aliis terris et tenementis ipsius Willelmi usque ad predictam summam per predictam extensionem sicut predictum est. Et pro hac etc. predictus Ricardus (concessitⁱ) pro se et heredibus suis quod ipsi acquietabunt predictum Willelmum de predicto debito

versus predictos Haginum et Salomenum et versus dictum Reginam de avro suo et similiter de omnibus aliis debitis que idem Willelmus et antecessores sui debebant in judaismo a principio seculi usque ad festum sanctorum Symone et Jude anno xlii et de avro Regine quantum pertinet ad debita illa et facta extenta predicta, et retornata coram Hugone le Bygod Justiciario Anglie, omnes cartas starras et alia instrumenta quocumque ad huiusmodi debita pertinent deliberare faciet predicto Willelmo. Concessit etiam predictus Ricardus pro se et heredibus suis quod per sacramentum predictorum extensorum estimentur dampna predicti Willelmi occasione predicti debiti ad festum sancti Hyllarii anno xlii non acquietati siqua sint. Et quod idem Ricardus eidem Willelmo (inde¹) satisfaciatur quamcitus predicta extenta coram prefato justiciario retornata fuerit sicut predictum est. Et similiter predictus Willelmus concessit quod si predictae pasture de Northgundermareys et Middelgundermareys non pertingant ad valenciam predictarum trescentarum et novem librarum per predictam extentam sicut predictum est, tunc per sacramentum predictorum extensorum estimentur dampna que idem Ricardus habuit a festo sancti Hillarii anno xlii ea occasione quod seisinam de superplusagio terre vel redditus usque ad predictam summam pecunie non dum habuerit. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod (in propria persona accedet ad predicta tenementa et¹) per sacramentum predictorum Johannis et aliorum extendi appreciari faciant predicta tenementa in forma qua predictum est. Et similiter quod inquirat de dampnis predictis et extensionem et inquisitionem etc. scire faciat in crastino Purificacionis beate Marie coram Rege ubicumque etc. distingite et aperte per litteras etc. et per duos etc.

Postea ad diem illum misit predictus vicecomes predictam extensionem factam per predictos extensores et similiter predictam inquisitionem. Et super hoc venit predictus Willelmus et calumpniat predictam extensionem, et dicit quod minus suffiecienter facta fuit eo quod facta fuit in absencia vicecomitis et similiter eo quod extensores non accesserunt ad predicta tenementa ad faciendam extensionem illam propter libertatem Comitis Albemarl' in quam non potuerunt intrare. Et petit quod iterato fiat extensio etc. in forma qua prius. Et ideo sicut prius preceptum est vicecomiti quod assumptis secum predictis extensoribus (non omittat propter libertatem predictis Comitis quin¹) accedat ad predicta tenementa et per eorum sacramentum extendi et appreciari faciant in forma predicta etc. Et similiter quod inquirat de dampna etc. Et extensionem etc. scire faciat a die Pasche in xv dies coram domino Rege ubicumque etc. per litteras etc. et per duos etc. Et tam predictus Willelmus quam predictus Ricardus concesserunt quod sive veniant ad predictam diem sive non quod iudicium tunc inter eos fiat secundum extensionem et inquisitionem que inde fient etc.

Postea ad diem illum misit vicecomes extensionem que dicit quod pasture de Northgundremareys et Middelgundremareys valent per annum xliii libras et xl denarios (et xx solidos redditus.¹) Et quod predictus Ricardus non occupavit nec attraxit sibi aliquas partes aliarum terrarum et tenementorum ipsius Willelmi ultra predictas pasturas et redditus, nisi hoc modo quod terre predicti Willelmi de feodo Comitis Albemarl' fuerunt in manu domine Regine pro avro suo quas dictus Ricardus de Oteringham habet per preceptum domine Regine quousque de avro suo fuerit satisfacionem de quater xx libras et decem pro debito Aaron judei de Ebor'. Item idem Willelmus de Lascellis habet in Oteringham de teriis que sunt in manu dicti Ricardi per dominam Reginam pro debito predicti Aaron scilicet in dominico x Bovatas quarum quelibet sine capitalum mesuagium valet per annum x solidos, unde (^{il}) solidos. Item idem Willelmus habet modo supradicto in villenagium ii Bovatas de quibus una valet per annum xvi solidos. Et alteria Bovata i marcam omnibus supra xxix solidos et iii^{or} denarios. Item idem Willelmus habet modo predicto in servicio liborum hominum l^aiii solidos et ii denarios per annum. Dicunt etiam quod si predictus Willelmus sustinuit aliqua dampna eo quod dictus Ricardus non acquietavit ipsum versus judeos nominatos in brevi ([ad]^{il}) ([festum]^{il}) sancti Hillarii anno xlii, hoc non stetit per ipsum Ricardum, set per dictum Willelmum quia non tenuit convencionem inter eos factam, nisi tantummodo quod (^{il}) in curia Willelmi de Lascellis (cecidit^{il}) per (^{il}) que estimatur ad xx solidos. Dicunt etiam quod dictus Ricardus sustinuit dampna eo quod non habuit seisinam de superplusagio terre et redditus ad valenciam lx^a et viii solidorum. Summa totius predictae extente xxliii libras, v solidos et x denarios de quibus xxliii libris, iii solidis, v denariis terre et redditus assignantur predicto Ricardo per predictis CCC et ix libris. Et residuum predictarum terrarum scilicet xxii solidos et iii denarios terre et redditus de terris propinquieribus capitali

mesuagio predicti Willelmi remanebunt predicto Willelmo. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod (eidem Ricardi¹) de omnibus predictis terris et tenementis que prius tenuit tam ex dimissione predicti Willelmi qua ex dimissione domine Regine in Otringham sicut predictum est, exceptis xxii solidis et iiii denariis terre et redditus de terris propinquieribus capitali mesuagiis predicti Willelmi sine delatione plenariam seisinam habere faciat. Et predicto Willelmo seisinam suam de xxii solidis et iiii denariis terre et redditus de terris propinquieribus mesuagiis predicti Willelmi, scilicet de predictis (decem¹) bovatis terre de dominico si sint propinquoiores predicto dominico quarum quelibet extenta est ad decem solidos per annum vel de predictis duabus bovatis terre de villenagio si sint propinquoiores etc. quarum una extenditur ad sex decim solidos et altera ad unam marcam. Et similiter preceptum est vicecomiti quod de terris etc. predicti Willelmi etc. fieri faciat xlviii solidos et illos habeat a die sancte Trinitatis in xv dies, ubicumque etc. ad reddendum predicto Ricardo pro dampnis suis etc. que habuit occasione quod predictus Willelmus seisinam suam de superplusagio terre et (redditus¹) ultra predictas trescentas et novem libras non dum habere fecit etc.

B187.(Yorkshire, T) It [is] agreed between William of Lascelles one party and Richard son of Martin of Ottringham as the other party concerning this; that whereas William complained that Richard ought to acquit him at the feast of Saint Hillary year 42 [13 January 1258], for twenty pounds against Hagin, a jew of Lincoln, and for one hundred and nine pounds against Solomon, a jew of London, and for the queen's gold for certain lands and tenements of which William enfeoffed Richard, namely for the pasture of Northgundermarsh and Middlegundermarsh and a rent of twenty shillings in Ottringham, Richard has not acquitted him. Likewise, [he complains] about the marsh and rent that Richard occupied and usurped to himself certain parts of William's lands and tenements. Wherefore, he was pleaded etc. such that William granted for himself and his heirs that the marshes and rent be surveyed and valued by John Frithmarsh, John of Danthorpe, William de la Tuere, Bernard Dareyngnes, Stephen of Hatfield, William of Wyton, William of Houghton, Arnold of Ottringham, Stephen of Burstwick, Thomas of Wyton, Alan of Saucey and Stephen of Camerton Hall, and that each twelvth pence worth of land, rent and pasture be allocated to Richard and his heirs for one mark up to three hundred and nine pounds silver. If the pasture and rent by that survey does not amount to three hundred and nine pounds, then it is to be made up to Richard and his heirs from all of William's lands and tenements from William's fee from the Earl of Aumale, in the same vill, up to the sum, namely from lands separte from William's chief messuage in the vill and near to Richard's messuages, until the extent was made up to the three hundred and nine marks silver. If William's land from the earl's fee does not suffice, then the rest of it is to be made up from William's other lands and tenements up to the sum, as is stated above. For this, Richard grants for himself and his heirs that they will acquit William of the debt against Hagin and Solomon and against the queen's gold and likewise for all debts in which William and his ancestors are held in jewery from the beginning of time to the feast of Saint Simon and Jude year 42 [28 October 1258] and for the queen's gold for the amount which pertains to those debts. The extent and the return was made before Hugh Bigod Justiciar of England. All charters, stars and other instruments pertaining to each debt were delivered to William. Richard also grants for himself and his heirs that by the oath of the aforesaid extensors the damages, whatever they were, arising from the debt shall be estimated to William from the feast of Saint Hillary year 42 [13 January 1258]. Richard shall satisfy William as soon as the extent has been returned to the justiciar, as is stated. Likewise, William grants that if by the survey the pastures of Northgundermarsh and Middlegundermarsh are not surveyed to the value of three hundred and nine pounds, as is stated above, then by the oath of the surveyors the damages which Richard had shall be estimated from the feast of Saint Hillary year 42 [13 January 1258], because he has not had seisin of the surplus lands and rents up to the aforesaid sum of money. So the sheriff is ordered to enter, in person, the tenements and by the oath of John and the others survey and appraise the tenements in the aforesaid form. Likewise, [he is ordered] that he inquire into the damages. The survey and the inquiry he shall make known on the morrow of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [3 February] *before the king* wherever [he shall be]. He shall sepcify and revela by his letters [patent] and by two [who conducted the survey].

Afterwards on the day, the sheriff sent the extent made by the extensors and likewise the inquiry. Concerning the above, William came and complained that the extention lacked sufficient examination, because it was done in the absence of the sheriff and likewise because the surveyors did not enter the tenements to make the survey because they were not able to enter the liberty of the Earl of Aumale. He requests that the survey be made again in the aforesaid form. So the sheriff is ordered, as before, that he take with him the surveyors and not to omit on account of the earl's liberty, to enter the tenements and on their oath survey and appraise [the land] in the aforesaid form. Likewise, he shall inquire into the damages. The survey is to be made known fifteen days from Easter before the king wherever [he shall be] by letters [patent] and by two [who conducted the survey]. William, as well as Richard, grant that whether they come on the day or not that judgement shall be given thereon according to the survey and the inquiry.

Afterwards on the day, the sheriff sent the survey which said that the pastures of Northgundermarsh and Middlegundermarsh are worth 14 pounds and 40 pence and 20 shillings per year. Richard neither occupied nor usurped any part of William's land and tenements beyond the pastures and rents, except the way in which William's land from the Earl of Aumale's fee were in the queen's hand for her gold which said Robert of Ottringham had through the queen's order until from her gold he was satisfied for 90 pounds for a debt to Aaron, a jew of York. Also, William Lascelles had in Ottringham land which was in Richard's hand, through the queen, for a debt to Aaron, likewise 10 bovates in demesne each of which, without the chief messuage, is worth 10 shillings per year () shillings. Also, William has in villeinage, as in demesne, 2 bovates, of which one is worth 16 shillings per year and the other bovat 1 mark. All the above [is worth] 29 shillings and 4 pence. Also, William has in the same way, by service of free men, 53 shillings and 2 pence per year. They also say that if William sustained any damages because Richard did not acquit him from the jews named in the writ at the feast of Saint Hillary year 42 [13 January 1258], he did not sustain them from Richard, but by William, because he did not to hold the agreement between them, except only that [Richard] in William of Lascelles court gave up by () which is estimated at 20 shillings. They also say that Richard sustained damage to the value of 68 shillings because he did not have seisin of all the lands and rents. The sum of the whole extent is 24 pounds, 5 shillings and 10 pence of which 23 pounds, 3 shillings, 5 pence of land and rent is assigned to Richard for the 309 pounds. The remainder of the land, namely 22 shillings and 4 pence of land and rent from lands nearest to William's chief messuage remains to William. So the sheriff is ordered without delay to make Richard have full seisin of all the lands and tenements in Ottringham which he previously held by demise from William as well as by demise from the queen, as is stated above, excepting the 22 shillings and 4 pence of land and rent from the lands nearest to William's chief messuage, and [likewise he shall make] William [have] his seisin of 22 shillings and 4 pence of land and rent from lands nearest to William's chief messuage, namely the ten bovates of demesne land if they are the nearest demesne of which each is surveyed at 10 shillings per year, or from the two bovates of land in villeinage if they are the nearest, of which each one is surveyed at 16 shillings per year and the other at one mark. Likewise, the sheriff is ordered that he raise from William's land 48 shillings and have them fifteen days from Trinitimas, wherever etc. to render them to Richard for his damages which he had on the occasion when William would not let him have his seisin of all the land and rent beyond the three hundred and nine pounds.

B188.(Ebor') Plegii Ricardi de Oteringam de prosequendo versus Willelmum Lasell', Galfridus de Camelford', Hugo de Sexon.

B188.(Yorkshire) Richard of Ottringham's pledges for prosecuting against William of Lascelles [are] Geoffrey of Camelford and Hugh of Sexon.

[Membrane 10]

Adhuc de Comitatu Surr'

Still Concerning the County of Surrey

B189.(T) Robertus de Watteuill' queritur de Magistero Galfrido de Fering' et de fratre Thoma de London' Canonico de Novo Loco quod cum Hospitale sancte Marie Magdalene (de Sandonⁱ) antiquitus fundatus esset per quendam Robertum de Watteuill' avum ipsius Roberti cuius heres ipse est et de feodo predicti Roberti ac idem Robertus avus et alii antecessores sui a prima fundacione predicti hospitalis semper constituerant magistros et recto(re)ⁱs in predicto hospitali, scilicet predictus Robertus avus quendam Ricardum de Blechingeleg' et etiam quidam Johannes de Wilehall' que tenuit manerio de Essere ad firmam de Roberto patre ipsius Roberti constituit quosdam Egidium canonicum de novo loco magisterum in predicto hospitali et post mortem ipsius Egidii quendam Ivonem capellanum. Ita quod semper post mortem unius substituerunt alium successive de magistero in magisterum ex assensu fratrum eiusdem hospitalis ratione quod predictum hospitale fundatum fuit de feodo ipsorum infra predictum manerium de Essere nullus ordinarius sive loci Diocesanus requisito assensu; predictus Magister Galfridus Officialis Electi Winton', iam uno anno elapso constituit predictum Thomam Canonicum magisterum in predicto hospitali sine assensu et voluntate ipsius Roberti (patroni eiusdemⁱ) et fratrum eiusdem hospitalis qui bona eiusdem consumpsit et devastavit. Ita quod ubi predictus Ivo qui ultimo obiit magister in eodem hospitali et fratres eiusdem sustentaverunt aliquando septem capellanos divinica celebrantes in eodem hospitali aliquando octo, predictus Thomas eiecit fere omnes fratres eiusdem ita quod non sunt ibi modo (nisi unoⁱ) capellano tantum. Et petit quod iusticia inde ei exhibeatur.

Et Magister Galfridus non venit. Et preceptum fuit vicecomiti quod faceret ipsum venire etc. Et vicecomes testatur quod nichil habet in comitatu isto per quod etc. Set predictus Thomas Canonicus venit et dicit quod revera predictus Magister Galfridus tradidit ei predictum hospitale custodiendum, set bene defendit quod nullum fratrem seu capellanum inde eiecit, nec bona eiusdem devastavit sicut ei imponit. Et petit quod inquiratur.

Juratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Robertus de Watteuill' avus predicti Roberti de Watteuill' qui modo queritur (tempore J. regisⁱ) dedit quandam partem terre sui in manerio suo de Esser' cuidam Ricardo Rippele capellano ad faciendum ibidem quoddam hospitale ad sustentacionem pauperum. Ita quod predictus capellanus de terris quas predictus Robertus ei dedit construxit predictum Hospitale de Sandon', et postea tantum perquisivit de terris et redditus et etiam elemosinis plurium qui beneficia sua contulerunt predicto hospitali quod tempore suo substituit octo cappellanos divinica celebrantes preter fratres et pauperes in eodem hospitali sustentatos. Et dicunt quod post mortem ipsius Ricardi capellani magister predicti hospitalis quidam Robertus de Watteuill' filius predicti Roberti senioris et pater istius Roberti tempore domini regis nunc constituit quemdam Ricardum de Brenthingel' capellanum magisterum eiusdem hospitalis ex assensu fratrum eiusdem et irrequisito assensu loci Diocesani qui predictos capellanos et fratres eiusdem toto tempore suo sustinuit. Et dicunt quod semper postea singuli magisteri qui exstiterant rectores in predicto hospitali electi fuerunt et constituit per predictum Robertum patrem istius Roberti (et firmarios suos etⁱ) ex assensu fratrum eiusdem hospiatlis quousque predictus Galfridus de Fering' Officialis Electi Winton' iam duobus annis elapsis calumpnians jus ipsius Electi loci Diocesani constituit predictum Thomam canonicum magisterum in predicto hospitali sine assensu istius Roberti qui modo queritur et fratrum eiusdem hospitalis. Ita quod predictus Robertus quamcitius pervenit ad noticiam eius eiecit predictum Thomam de predicto hospitali. Et postmodo venit predictus Galfridus et supplicabit predicto Roberto ita quod idem Robertus permisit ipsum (Thomamⁱ) moram facere per (unumⁱ) annum in predicto hospitali et postea ipsum inde eiecit. Et tunc venit interim predictus Galfridus et constituit ipsum (Thomamⁱ) rectorem in predicto hospitali et excommunicavit predictum Robertum. Ita quod idem Robertus per complusionem ipsius Magisteri Galfridi permisit predictum Thomam morari in eodem hospitali usque nunc. Et dicunt quod idem Thomas extunc devastavit bona eiusdem hospitalis et fratres et capellanos eiusdem amovit (sine assensu et voluntate predicti Roberti.ⁱ) Ita quod non sunt ibi modo nisi tantum duo capellani celebrantes divinica ubi octo esse solebant. Et ideo dictum est predicto Thome quod recedat a predicto hospiatli et penitus cesset magistratim illius. Et predictus Robertus talem custodem (Ydoneumⁱ) eligat et in eodem hospiatli constituat quem ad hoc compertere viderit etc.

B189.(T) Robert of Watevile complains againsy Master Geoffrey of Feering and against brother

Thomas of London a canon of Newstead that whereas the Hospital of Saint Mary Magdalen of Sandon was founded a long time ago by a certain Robert of Wateville, Robert's grandfather, whose heir he is, from Robert's fee, Robert, the grandfather and to all his ancestors, from the [time of the] first founding of the hospital always elected the master and rectors of the hospital. Thus, Robert, his grandfather, [elected] a certain Richard of Blechingley and also John of Wainhill, who held the manor of Esher at farm from Robert. Robert's father elected as master Giles a canon of Newstead. After Giles' death [he elected] a certain Ivo. Thus, always after the death of one [master] they substituted another successive master in masterhood with the approval of the brothers of the hospital, because the hospital was founded from their fee within the manor of Esher. No ordinary or local diocesan [gave their] consent or approval.. Master Geoffrey, an official of [Aymer] the Elect of Winchester, one year ago elected Thomas, a canon, master in the hospital without the approval or will of Robert the patron or the brothers of the hospital whose goods Thomas consumed and devastated. Thus, [whereas] Ivo, who died the last master in the hospital, and the brothers sustained sometimes seven or eight chaplains to celebrate mass, Thomas ejected nearly all the brothers so that there is now but only one chaplain there. He seeks that justice be shown him.

Master Geoffrey has not come. So the sheriff was ordered to make him come. The sheriff testifies that he has nothing in this county by which [he can be distrained]. But Thomas the canon comes and says that Master Geoffrey surrendered the hospital to his custody, but he readily maintains that he did not eject his brother chaplains, nor did he devastate their goods as he alleges. He seeks that this is examined.

The jurors say upon their oath that Robert of Wateville, Robert's grandfather, in King John's time gave a certain part of his land in his manor of Esher to Richard Ripley, a chaplain, to build a hospital to provide for the poor. Thus, the chaplain on the lands which Robert gave to him constructed the Hospital of Sandon. Afterwards, he obtained [enough support] from the lands and rents and also [from] the pure alms which his benefice brought to the hospital so that during his time he sustained eight chaplains to celebrate mass, excepting the brothers and the paupers. They say that after Richard's death, Robert of Wateville, son of the aforesaid Robert senior and this Robert's father, elected with the brothers' approval, and without the approval of the deputy of the diocesan, Richard of Blechingley as master of the hospital, during the present king's time. He sustained the chaplains and brothers for his whole time as master. They say that afterwards each master who stood as rector in the hospital was elected and constituted by Robert, Robert's father, and his signatories and with the brothers' approval, until Geoffrey of Feering, an official of the elect of Winchester, some two years ago, complaining on behalf of the elect's right in the diocese, elected Thomas as master in the hospital without Robert's approval or that of the brothers'. Thus, as soon as Robert learned of the news he ejected Thomas from the hospital. Afterwhich Geoffrey came and begged Robert [to be allowed to remain]; thus Robert allowed Thomas to remain in the hospital for one year and thereafter ejected him. Then, Geoffrey came and elected Thomas as rector of the hospital and excommunicated Robert. Thus, until now Robert was forced by Master Geoffrey to allow Thomas to reside in the hospital. They say that Thomas thereafter devastated the goods of the hospital and the brothers and chaplains left without Robert's assent or will. Thus, there is now but two chaplains to celebrate mass, whereas there used to be eight. So it is said to Thomas that he leave the hospital and wholly cease to be its master. Robert shall choose a suitable custodian whom he thinks competent and constitute him in the hospital.

B190. Willelmus faber de Kingeston' in *miser cordia*⁴⁵ pro falso clamore versus Radulfum de Hoo.

B190. William smith of Kingston [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Ralph of Hoo.

B191.(T) Rogerus filius Johannis (de Sancto Johanneⁱ) et Johannes de la Gerston' queruntur de Willelmo de la Gerston' quod ipse die mercurii in festo sancti Edmundi Martir' proximo

⁴⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

preterito vi et armis venit ad quendam boscum (in Wolkestedⁱ) quem iidem Rogerus et Johannes tenent pro indivisio et ibidem prostravit iiii^{xx} arbores et asportavit contra pacem etc.

Et Willelmus venit et bene cognoscit quod prostrari fecit predictas arbores in predicto bosco et juste quia dicit quod quedam Matilda de la Gerston' mater ipsorum (Johannisⁱ) et Willelmi tenet terciam partem (medietatemⁱ) predicti bosci in dotem de dono et dotacione cuiusdam Willelmi de la Gerston' quondam viri sui. Et dicit quod ipse ex precepto ipsius Matilde prostrari fecit predictas arbores, set quod non contra pacem ponit se super patriam. Et iuratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predicta Matilda pro voluntate sua bis vel ter prostrari fecit arbores in predicto (boscoⁱ) dum predictus Rogerus fuit in Wascon' et predictus Johannes apud sanctum Jacobum, set nescunt utrum ipsa inde dotata esset, nec ne. Et quia predictus Willelmus dicit quod predicta Matilda mater eius habet scripta et monumenta per que ipsa dotata fuit, dictum est ei quod habeat illa hic die Lune proximo post festum sancte Lucie. Ad diem illum venit predicta Matilda et ostendit pro se quod ipsa dotata est de tercia parte medietatis predicti bosci. Et super hoc Contentos sunt. Et Rogerus dat *ii marcas*⁴⁶ pro licencia concordandi et Johannes *i marcam*⁴⁷ pro eodem. Et est concordia talis (scilicetⁱ) quod predictus Boscus dividatur inter eos per certas metas et divisas. Ita quod utrique ipsorum Rogeri et Johannis sciat suum sepeale. Et similiter predictus Johannes concedit quod de parte sua assignabit eidem Matilde terciam partem nomine dotis. Et Matilda tenet se inde contentam. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod per sacramentum proborum etc. dividi faciat predictum boscum per certas metas etc. Ita quod utrique ipsorum assignetur pars sua pro diviso. Et postea de parte ipsius Johannis eidem Matilde terciam partem assignari faciat nomine dotis etc. Et per quas particulas etc. scire faciat in Crastino Purificacionis beate Marie ubicumque etc.

B191.(T) Roger son of John of Saint John and John de la Garston complain against William de la Garston that he, on the Wednesday during the last feast of Saint Edmund the Martyr [20 November 1258], came with force of arms to a wood in Walkingstead which Roger and John held individually and there he knocked down 80 trees and carried [them] off against the peace.

William comes and acknowledges that he knocked down the trees in the wood and justly so, since he says that Matilda de la Garston, John and William's mother, held a third part of half the wood in dower from a gift and dowery from William de la Garston, once her husband. He says that with Matilda's consent he knocked down the trees, but not against the peace. On this he places himself on the country. The jurors say upon their oath that Matilda, at her own will, two or three times caused the trees in the wood to be knocked down while Roger was in Gascony and John at Saint James. But they do not know whether she was dowered of it or not. Since, William says that Matilda, his mother, has a deed and muniment by which she was dowered, it is said to William that he have these here on the next Monday after the feast of Saint Lucy [16 December]. On that day Matilda came and showed for herself that she was dowered of the third part of half of the wood. The above are content on this. Roger gives *2 marks* for a licence to agree and John gives *1 mark* for the same. The agreement is as such, namely that the wood is to be divided between them along certain boundaries and divisions. Thus, both Roger and John shall have theirs separately. Likewise, John grants that from the part assigned to him Matilda shall have her dower third. Matilda holds herself content. So the sheriff is ordered that on the oath of proven [and law-worthy men] to divide the wood along certain boundaries. Thus, each side is assigned their part individually. Afterwards from John's portion Matilda was assigned her dower third. Those particulars he shall make known on the morrow of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [3 February], wherever [the king shall be].

B192. Willelmus de Ores et Maria uxor eius cognoscunt quod debent Priori de Bermundes' octo marcas exceptis duobus denariis quas ei reddent ad Purificacionem beate Mairie anno xliii.

⁴⁶Margin note by scribe, ii. m. crossed out.

⁴⁷Margin note by scribe, i. m. crossed out.

Et nisi fecerint concedunt quod idem Prior teneat xl^a acras terre et sex acras prati cum pertinenciis in Retherheth' que sunt de hereditate ipsius Marie in pretio quinque marcarum, viii solidorum et iiii denariorum per annum, quosque (plures ^{ul}) de exitibus predicte terre et prati plenarie perceperit predictos septem marcas, xiii solidos et ii denarios. Et quamcito illas inde plenarie percepit predictam terram et pratum predictis Willelmo et Marie vel heredibus ipsius Marie restituet. Ita cum quod si predictus Prior necessitatem habuerit interim (custusⁱ) apponere circa wallas reperandas [vel] ad defendendum predictam terram, (predictis^s) Willelmus et Maria eidem Priori de custu predicto satisfaciant.

B192. William of Ores and Mary his wife acknowledge that they owe the prior of Bermondsey eight marks, less two pence, which they shall render to him at the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 43 [2 February 1259]. If they do not, they grant that the prior shall hold 40 acres of land and six acres of meadow in Rotherhithe, worth 8 shillings and 4 pence per year, which [holdings] are Mary's inheritance, until from the outgoings of the land and meadow he fully recovers the seven marks and 13 shillings and 2 pence. Immediately after he fully recovers [the money], he shall restore the land and meadow to William and Mary or Mary's heirs. Thus, if the prior in the meantime incurs any expense to repair the embankments [or] to defend the land, William and Mary shall satisfy the prior of the cost.

B193.(Essex') Robertus Blundus cognoscit quod debet Waltero de Crek' xxvi marcas pro quibus tradidit eidem Waltero quamdam terram in Thorp' in Hundredo de Ro([ch]^{il})eford' quam idem Robertus habuit de dono (predicti^{ul}) Johannis de Thorp', Tenendam eidem Waltero a Crastino conceptionis beate Marie anno xliii usque in duos annos proximo sequentibus.

B193.(Essex) Robert Blund acknowledges that he owes Walter of Creake 26 marks for which [sum] he surrendered to Walter land in Thorpe in the hundred of Rocheford, which [land] Walter had as a gift from John of Thorpe, to hold from the morrow of the Conception of the Blessed Mary year 43 [9 December 1258] for the following two years.

B194. Edwardus le Marchaunt, Thurstanus Dille, Ricardus le Bedel, Thomas Osbern, Petrus filius Edwardi et Walterus le Comber rettati de inprisonamento Willelmi de Bonhet, unde idem Willelmus obiit, veniunt. Et defendunt inprisonamentum et totum. Et ponunt se super patriam de bono et malo. Et xii juatores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predicti Edwardus et alii non sunt culpabiles de predicto inprisonamento neque de predicta morte. Ideo inde *quieti*. Set dicunt quod quidam Rogerus le Warner eum inprisonavit modo quo predictum est. Qui modo non venit. Et super hoc testatum est quod subtraxit se pro predicto maleficio et quod non est inventus in comitatu isto. Ideo *exigatur et utlagetur*. Et catalla eius confiscantur pro fuga.

B194. Edward le Merchant, Thurstan Dille, Richard the Beadler, Thomas Osbern, Peter son of Edward and Walter le Comber, accused of imprisoning William of Bonet who died, come. The deny imprisonment and everything. They place themselves on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors say upon their oath that Edward and the others are not guilty of the imprisonment or the death. So they are *quit*. But, they say that Roger le Warrener imprisoned him in the aforesaid manner. He has not come. It is testified that he fled for the wrong-doing and he cannot be found in this county. So he is to be *exacted* and *outlawed*. His chattels are to be confiscated for flight.

[Membrane 10d.]

Adhuc de Assisis de Comitatu Surr'

Still Concerning Assizes from the County of Surrey

B195.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. si Prior de Merton' injuste etc. disseisivit Willelmum de la Legh' de communia pasture sue in la Legh' que pertinet ad librum tenementum suum in eadem villa post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de communia pasture in quodam bosco

qui continet circiter xxx^{ta} acras in quibus communicare solebat cum omnimodis averiis suis per totum annum, preter quam in tempore Pesone in quo idem Willelmus habere solebat communam ad porcos suos pro decimo porco dando, vel pro quolibet porco unum denarium si non habeat decem porcos quousque predictus Prior ipsum impedivit quominus ibidem communicare potest sicut solebat. Et Prior non venit, set quidam Walterus clericus ballivus suus venit et respondet pro eo. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit quod predictus Willelmus nunquam fuit in seisinâ tempore ipsius Prioris communicandi in predicto bosco. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Dicit etiam quod si aliqua disseisina ei unquam inde facta fuisset, hoc fuit per quendam Robertum predecessorum suum quondam Priorem de Merton' et non per ipsum. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Et juratores super sacramentum suum hoc idem testantur. Ideo Consideratum est quod predictus Prior inde sine die. Et predictus Willelmus nichil capiat per assisam istam. Et sit in *misericordia*⁴⁸ pro falso clamore.

B195.(Surrey) Did the prior of Merton disseise William de la Leigh of his common pasture which pertains to his free tenement in Leigh? He complains that the prior has disseised him of common pasture in a certain wood which contains around 30 acres in which he was accustomed to common throughout the year with all his beasts, except during the autumn when William was accustomed to have common for 10 pigs, giving one pence for each pig if he did not have ten pigs, until the prior impeded him from commoning there as he was accustomed. The prior has not come, but Walter clerk, his bailiff comes and answers for him. He says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says that William was never in seisin commoning in the wood, during the prior's time, so that he could be disseised. He also says that if any disseisin was ever made to him it was by Robert, his predecessor as prior of Merton, and not by him. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors upon their oath testify to this. So it is adjudged that the prior is without a day. William takes nothing by this assize and is in *mercy* for false claim.

B196.(Sussex') Ricardus de Pecham cognoscit quod debet Henrico de Bathonia quatuor decim marcas quas ei reddet ad Purificacionem beate Marie anno xliii ad domum ipsius Henrici in London'. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

B196.(Sussex) Richard of Peckham acknowledges that he owes Henry de Bath fourteen marks which he shall render at Henry's house in London at the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 43 [2 February 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

B197.(Surr') Ass. ven. rec. Quis advocatus tempore pacis presentavit ultimam personam que mortua est ad Ecclesiam de Shyre, que vacat etc. Cuius advocacionem Abbas de Loco sancti Edwardi clamat versus Johannem filium Johannis. Qui veniunt. Et concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis, quod predictus Abbas recognoscit advocacionem predictæ Ecclesie cum pertinentiis esse jus ipsius Johannis. Et illam remisit et quietumclamavit de se et succesoribus suis et Ecclesia sua sancti Edwardi de Latteleg' predicto Johanne et heredibus suis imperpetuum. Et pro hac etc. predictus Johannes dat eidem Abbati decem libras sterlingorum, quas ei reddet in Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie anno xliii. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes fieri faciat de terris etc. Et preterea idem Johannes concessit quod presentabit hac vite quendam Walterum de Thikehull' clericum predicti Abbatis ad predictam Ecclesiam etc. Et habent cyrographum etc.

B197.(Surrey) Who, in time of peace, presented the last parson, who is [now] dead, to the Church of Shere which is now vacant? The abbot of Netley claims the advowson against John son of John. They come. They are agreed by licence. The agreement is as such; that the abbot recognizes the advowson of the church to be John's right, and he remits and quitclaims himself and his successors and his Church of Netley to John and his heirs in perpetuity. For this, John gives the abbot ten pounds sterling which he shall render in the

⁴⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 43 [9 February 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands. Moreover, John granted and presented Walter of Tickhill, the abbot's clerk, to the church for this life. Let them have a chirograph.

B198.(Surr') Memorandum quod Johannes de Fraxino, Ricardus de Brungfeld', Robertum de Winton', Hubertus aurifaber, Henricus Suan, Alanus de Benetleg', Robertus le Cordewan', Galfridus le Puer, Michaelis de Trie, Ricardus de Trye, Willelmus de sancte Martino, Reginaldus le Vinet', Phillipus de Glouc', et Willelmus de Farnham manuceperunt habendi Ricardum de Coterfaud' rettatum de transgressione in Parco Johannis Mannsell' de Hertung' coram H. le Bygod in proximo adventu suo in Comitatu Sussex' etc.

B198.(Surrey) Memorandum that John of Fresne, Richard of Broomfield, Robert of Winchester, Hubert goldsmith, Henry Suane, Alan of Bently, Robert le Cordwainer, Geoffrey le Puer, Michael of Trye, Richard of Trye, William of Saint Martin, Reginald le Vintner, Philip of Gloucester and William of Farnham undertake to have Richard of Cotterfold, accused of a transgression to John Mansel's park in Harting, before [Hugh] Bigod in his next coming to the county of Sussex.

[Membrane 11]

Placita de assisis, Juratis et Querelis apud Cantuar' Coram Hugone le Bygod Justiciario Anglie et Egidio de Erdington' Die dominica proximo ante festum sancti Hillarii, anno xliii.

Pleas Concerning Assizes, Jury-Pleas and Complaints at Canterbury before Hugh Bigod Justiciar of England and Giles of Erdington on the first Sunday before the Feast of Saint Hillary year 43 [12 January 1259].

B199.(Kant') Godvith' le Lepere qui tulit assisam nove disseisine versus Reginaldum le Lepere de tenemento in Thorneham venit et retraxit se ideo ipsi et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*, scilicet Benedictus de la Ware et Willelmus Sutor de Merdon'.

B199.(Kent) Godwith le Lepere, who brought an assize of novel dissesin against Reginald le Lepere concerning a tenement in Thornham, comes and withdraws his suit. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely Benedict de la Ware and William Sutor of Marden.

B200.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Rogerus de Langeport injuste etc. disseisivit Malildam filiam Willelmi de Elmedest' de libero tenemento suo in Hertlepe post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eam de uno mesuagio undecim acris terre et dimidia et duabus acris bosci et dimidia cum pertinentiis. Et Rogerus venit, et dicit quod assisa non debet inde fieri versus eum quia dicit quod ipse nichil clamat in predictis tenementis neque feodum neque liberum tenementum. Dicit enim quod domina Regina Anglie cuius ballivus ipse est, est in seisin de eisdem tenementis ex tradicionem cuiusdam Roberti de Godyneton' qui eadem tenementa ei dimisit, tenenda usque ad legitimam etatem eiusdem Matilde (que^{ul}) scilicet a termino Pasche proximo preterito, usque ad festum sancti Michaelis proximo futuro, unde dicit quod sine ipsa domina Regina non po^{il}st ipse rem istam deducere in iudicium. Dicit etiam quod si aliqua disseisina ei inde facta fuit, hoc fuit per predictum Robertum et non per ipsum. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod quedam Agnes mater predictae Matilde aliquo tempore tenuit predicta tenementa in custodia cum predicta Matilda et postea forisfecit ob quod custodiam illam amisit. Ita quod ballivus domini regis [de] Hundredo de Middleton' seisivit predictam custodiam in manu domini regis et postea dimisit predictam custodiam predicto Roberto de Godington' pro *dimidia marca* quam ei dedit. Et dicunt quod idem Robertus statim postea dimisit eandem custodiam predicto Rogero ballivo domine Regine ad opus ipsius domine Regine etc.

Post venit predictus Rogerus et concedit predictae Matilde quantum in ipso est predicta mesuagium et boscum cum pertinentiis et similiter duas acras terre et dimidiam seminatam

cum frumento de predicta terra, illas scilicet que jacent ex parte aus([tra]^{il})li de Hertlepe juxta terram Johannis Kaym, et illa ei reddidit etc. Et post festum sancti Michaelis, residuum totius predictae terre remaneat predictae Matilde et heredibus suis quieti de predicto Rogero etc. si domina Regina perhebeat assensum etc. Ideo inde *loquendum* cum domina Regina.

B200.(Kent) Did Roger of Langport disseise Matilda daughter of William of Elmstead of her free tenement in Hartlip? She complains that he has disseised her of one messuage, eleven and a half acres of land and two and a half acres of wood. Roger comes and says the assize ought not to be taken against him, since he says that he claims nothing in the tenements neither fee nor free tenement. In fact, he says that the queen of England, whose bailiff he is, is in seisin of the tenements by demise from Robert of Godinton, who demised the tenements to her to hold until Matilda is of age, namely from last Easter [24 March 1258] until the coming feast of Saint Michael [29 September]. Wherefore, he says that without the queen he cannot answer these things in judgment. He also says that if any disseisin was made to her it was [done] by Robert and not by him. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that Agnes, Matilda's mother, once held the tenements in custody with Matilda and afterwards committed an offence for which she lost that custody. Thus, the king's bailiff from the hundred of Milton Regis seized the custody into the king's hand. Afterwards, the king demised it to Robert of Godinton for a half mark, which he gave him. They say that Robert immediately, afterwards, demised the custody to Roger, the queen's bailiff for the benefit of the queen.

Afterwards, Roger came and granted Matilda as much as he can in the messuage and wood and likewise in the two and half acres sown with wheat, namely those which lie towards the South of Hartlip next to John Kaym's land. He rendered those to her. After the feast of Saint Michael [29 September], the remainder of all the land shall return to Matilda and her heirs quit of Roger [and his heirs] if the queen gives her consent. So *it is to be discussed* with the queen.

B201.(Kant') Willelmus de Dedling' et Johannes le Bedel attachiati fuerunt ad respondendum Ade de Pechehurst de placito quare vi et armis venerunt ad terram ipsius Ade in Stapelhurst et Blada ipsius Ade messuerunt et asportaverunt et arbores ipsius Ade in terra sua crescentes succiderunt et illas una cum alio merenio et cum duabus carreis feni ceperunt et asportaverunt contra pacem etc. Et unde predictus Adam queritur quod predicti Willelmus et Johannes die veneris proximo ante festum sancti Michaelis anno xlii venerunt ad terram ipsius Ade in Stapelhurst et predictum transgressionem ei fecerunt unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam x librarum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et Willelmus et Johannes veniunt et deffendunt vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendunt quod Blada predicti Ade non messuerunt nec arbores suas succiderunt nec merenium suum nec fenum asportaverunt sicut ei imponit. Set dicunt quod cum predictus Adam teneat de predicto Willelmo quoddam tenementum in Stapelhurst et sectam debeat ad Curiam ipsius Willelmi de tribus septimanis in tres septimanas pro predicto tenemento predictus Adam subtraxit se de faciendo predictam sectam. Ita quod predictus Willelmus per considerationem curie sue distrinxit predictum Adam ad faciendum predictam sectam et ad reddendum ei servicium pro predicto tenemento sibi-----debitum de quibus similiter se subtraxit et arestare fecit (super feodum illumⁱ) duas coppas avene in predicto tenemento invenientas et similiter predictum merenium et predictum fenum. Set quod arbores suas non succidit nec bladum nec merenium nec fenum asportavit sicut ei imponit, ponit se super patriam. Et Adam similiter ideo fiat inde jurata.

Juratores dicunt quod predicti Willelmus de Detling' et Johannes le Bedel venerunt ad terram predicti Ade in Staplehurst et ibidem ceperunt quinquaginta ligna de merenio et duas coppas de avena et duas carretates feni et ea cariauerunt ad domum predicti Willelmi in Stapelhurst. Set dicunt quod non succiderunt aliquas arbores in bosco predicti Ade sicut idem Adam eis imponit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Adam recuperet dampna sua versus predictos Willelmum et Johannem que taxantur ad ix solidos. Et predicti Willelmus et Johannes committantur *gaole*⁴⁹ pro transgressionem. Et predictus Adam sit in *miserordia*⁵⁰

⁴⁹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

pro falso clamore versus ipsos.

B201.(Kent) William de Detling and John the Beadler were attached to answer Adam of Penshurst concerning a plea whereby they came with force of arms to Adam's land in Staplehurst and reaped Adam's crop and carried it off, cut down Adam's trees and timbered one after the other and seized and carried off two cart-loads of hay against the peace. Adam complains that William and John came to Adam's land in Staplehurst on the first Friday before the feast of Saint Michael year 42 [29 September 1258] and carried out the transgression. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 10 pounds. Thereon he produces suit.

William and John come and deny force and injury. They readily maintain that they did not reap Adam's crop, nor did they cut down his trees nor timber them nor carry off the hay as he alleges. But, they say that since Adam holds a tenement in Staplehurst of William and owes suit at William's court every three weeks for the tenement [and] Adam withdrew himself from making the suit, William, by verdict of his court, distrained Adam to make the suit and to render the service owed to him for the tenement-----from which he withdrew. [Thus], from the fee, William seized 2 shocks of oats found on the tenement and likewise the timber and hay. But, he neither cut down his trees nor did he carry off the crop, timber, or hay, as he alleges. On this he places himself on the country. Adam [does] likewise, so let there be a jury trial thereon.

The jurors say that William de Detling and John the Beadler came to Adam's land in Staplehurst and there they seized fifty feet of timber, two shocks of oats and two cart-loads of hay and they carried it off to William's house in Staplehurst. But they say that they did not cut down any trees from Adam's wood, as Adam alleges against them. So it is adjudged that Adam recovers his damages against William and John, which are assessed at 9 shillings. William and John are to be committed to *gaol* for the transgression. Adam is in *mercy* for false claim against them.

B202. Thomas de Heselerton queritur de Henrico Malemeyns de Plukele de hoc quod cum idem Thomas vendidisset predicto Henrico unum equum (^{il}) sancti Nicholai anno xxxix pro xiiii marcis et dimidia de quibus ei reddidit C solidos Et septem marcas ei reddidisse debuit ad Pascham anno xxxix predictus Henricus detinet ei predictas septem marcas unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam x librarum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et Henricus venit et deffendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene deffendit quod predictus Thomas nullam equum ei vendidit. Set dicit quod predictus Thomas vendidit quendam equum cuidam Egidio de Badelemere. Et predictus Egidius vendidit equum illum ipsi Henrici. Et quod predictus Thomas nullum equum ei vendidit ponit se super patriam. Et Thomas similiter.

Postea concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis videlicet quod predictus Henricus cognovit quod reddet predicto Thome sex marcas die Jovis proxima ante Purificacionem Beate Marie anno xliii apud Cantuar'. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et pro hac etc. predictus Thomas remittit ei residuum illius debeti scilicet i marcam. Et similiter omnia dampna etc. Et predictus Thomas ponit loco suo Johannem Welond' ad recipiendum predictas sex marcas si ipse tunc ibi inter esse non possit etc.

B202. Thomas of Heselerton complains against Henry Malesmains of Pluckley concerning this that whereas Thomas sold Henry a () horse [at] the [feast] of Saint Nicholas year 39 [6 December 1254] for 14 1/2 marks for which he rendered 100 shillings to him and he ought to have rendered seven marks to him at Easter year 39 [28 March 1255], Henry withholds the seven marks. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 10 pounds. Thereon he produces suit.

Henry comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that Thomas did not sell him a horse. But, he says that Thomas sold a horse to Giles of Badlesmere. Giles [then] sold the horse to Henry. That Thomas did not sell him a horse, on this he places himself on the country. Thomas [does] likewise.

⁵⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Afterwards, they are agreed by licence. The agreement is as such, namely that Henry acknowledges that he owes Thomas six marks [to be paid] on the first Thursday before the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 43 [30 January 1259] at Canterbury. If he does [not pay], he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands. For this, Thomas remits to him the remainder of that debt, namely 1 mark and likewise all damages. Thomas appoints as his attorney John Weylond to receive the six marks, if at that time he is unable [to receive them].

B203.(Kant') Johannes de Godyneton' concessit et reddidit Matilde filie Agnete de Elmested' xl acras terre cum pertinenciis in Shepey' quas Robertus de Godinton' pater eius habuit in custodia ex dimissione Thome de Hegham. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat ei habere seisinam suam etc.

B203.(Kent) John of Godinton grants and renders to Matilda daughter of Agnes of Elmstead 40 acres of land in Sheppey which Robert of Godinton, his father, had in custody by demise from Thomas of Higham. So the sheriff is ordered to make her have her seisin.

B204.(Suff') Nicholaus de Cryol ponit loco suo Simonem Lovel versus Reginaldum de Evermuth' et Isabellam uxorem eius ad recipiendum cyrographum de duabus partibus manerii de Denhal' cum pertinenciis. Et Johanna uxor eius ponit loco suo Galfridum de Erde versus eosdem de eodem.

B204.(Suffolk) Nicholas of Criol appoints as his attorney Simon Lovel against Reginald of Evermue and Isabel his wife to receive a chirograph concerning two parts of the manor of Denhall. Joan his wife appoints as her attorney Geoffrey of Herde against the same concerning the same.

B205 Rogerus de Petra, Walterus Fyggard', Ricardus Godhewe, Jordanus de Capella, Robertus Ciffor et Radulfus de Bungeye ponunt loco suo Robertum le Dyacone versus ballivos Archiepiscopi de placito transgressionis. Et similiter ponunt loco suo Ricardum carpentar' etc.

B205. Roger of Petra, Walter Fyggard, Richard Godhewe, Jordan of Capella, Robert Ciffor and Ralph of Bungeye appoint as their attorney Robert le Deacon against the bailiffs of the archbishop concerning a plea of trespass. Likewise, they appoint Richard carpenter as their attorney.
[Cross-reference: ? B214-B217]

B206.(Kant') Bartholomeus de Hegham et Johannes frater eius ponunt loco suo Robertum de Hegham versus Agatham que fuit uxor Johannis de Mares de placito dotis etc.

B206.(Kent) Bartholomew of Higham and John his brother appoint as their attorney Robert of Higham against Agatha who was the wife of John of Mares, concerning a plea of dower.

B207. Rogerus de Leyburne ponit loco suo Nicholaum de Corbye clericum ad respondendum pro ipso siquando super eum sit quermonia.

B207. Roger de Leybourne appoints as his attorney Nicholas of Corby a clerk to answer for him if there are complaints against him.

B208.(Kant') Johanna uxor (Johannis filiiⁱ) Ricardi de Gravelegh' ponit loco suo Johannem virum suum versus Johannem de Edelineston' (et alios in breviⁱ) de placito assise mortis antecessoris.

B208.(Kent) Joan wife of John son of Richard of Graveney appoints as her attorney her husband John against John of Edlington and others named in the writ concerning an assize of mort d' ancestor.

B209. Alicia de Folkinden' ponit loco suo Willelmum filium suum versus Willelmum le Franceys de placito transgressionis.

B209. Alice of Folkington appoints as her attorney her son William against William le Franceys concerning a plea of trespass.

B210.(Kant') Agatha que fuit uxor Willelmi de Kasingham ponit loco suo Willelmum de Bodyham vel Johannem de Athewalden' versus Rogerum de Beniden' et alios de placito transgressionis.

B210.(Kent) Agatha who was the wife of William of Kensham appoints as her attorneys William of Bodenham or John of Athewalden against Roger of Bevenden and other named in the writ, concerning a plea of trespass.

B211. Cristiana uxor Willelmi de Byholt ponit loco suo ipsum Willelmum virum suum versus Johannem de Shonynton' de placito transgressionis etc.

B211. Christiana wife of William of Byholt appoints as her attorney her husband William against John of Shonynton concerning a plea of trespass.

B212. Parothiam de Wycheling' ponit loco suo Willelmum Gangy versus Galfridum personam de Wycheling' de placito transgressionis.

B212. Parothiam of Wichling appoints as her attorney William Gangy against Geoffrey parson of Wichling concerning a plea of trespass.

B213. Homines de Cumb' ponunt loco suo Ricardum de Cumb' versus Willelmum de Sey de placito transgressionis etc.

B213. The men of Coombe appoint as their attorney Richard of Coombe against William of Say concerning a plea of trespass.

[Membrane 11d.]

B214. Henricus de Burne, Ricardus de Sardene (etⁱ) Anselinus de Maydenestan attachiati fuerunt ad respondendum Rogero de Petra de Snodilond' de placito quare abstulerunt eidem Rogero in foro de Mallinge unam equum contra pacem etc. Et unde predictus Rogerus queritur quod predicti Henricus et Ricardus die Sabbati proximo ante Conversionem sancti Pauli anno xxxix fecerunt ei predictum transgressionem unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xx solidorum.

B214. Henry of Bourne, Richard of Sarsden and Anselm of Maidstone were attached to answer Roger of Petra of Snodland concerning a plea whereby, from the market of Malling, they took one horse from Roger against the peace. Roger complains that Henry and Richard carried out the transgression on the first Saturday before the Conversion of Saint Paul year 39 [23 January 1255]. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 20 shillings.
[Cross-reference: B217]

B215. Walterus Fyggard queritur de eisdem Henrico et Ricardo quod predictus die et anno et in mercato predicto abstulerunt ei unum equum ad dampnum ipsius Walteri ad valenciam xx solidorum.

B215. Walter Fyggard complains against the same Henry and Richard that at the aforesaid market on the same day and year they took one horse from him, to Walter's loss of 20 shillings.
[Cross-reference: B217]

- B216. Ricardus Godhewe (Jordanus de Capella, Robertus Cifforⁱ) queruntur de eisdem Henrico et Ricardo quod in predicto mercato eisdem die et anno abstulerunt cuilibet ipsorum unum equum ad dampnum ipsius Ricardi ad valenciam xv solidorum. Et ad dampnum ipsius Jordani ad valenciam xx solidorum. Et ad dampnum ipsius Roberti ad valenciam xv solidorum. Et inde producunt sectam etc.
- B216. Richard Godhewe, Jordan of Capella [and] Robert Ciffor complain against the same Henry and Richard that at the aforesaid market on the same day and year they took one horse from each of them, to Richard's loss of 20 shillings, Jordan's loss of 20 shillings and Robert's loss of 25 shillings. Thereon they produce suit.
[Cross-reference: B217]
- B217. Radulfus de Bungeye queritur de predicto Henrico de Burne et Thome Soreng' quod ipsi vi et armis venerunt apud Trotesclive die veneris proxima ante festum Sancti Bartholomei anno xxxix et ibi ceperunt septem oves ipsius Radulfi in pastura Episcopi Roff' et eas abduxerunt et eas adhuc detinent ad dampnum ipsius Radulfi ad valenciam i marce.
- Et Henricus, Ricardus et alii veniunt et deffendunt vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene deffendunt contra ipsos et sectam suam quod vi et armis et contra pacem domini Regis non ceperunt predictas equos et oves. Et predicti Henricus de Burne, Anselmus de Maydinestan' et Thomas Soreng' dicunt quod revera ipsi fuerunt ballivi Archiepiscopi Cantuar'. Et quod predicti Rogerus de Petra et alii qui modo queruntur de ipsis, amerciati fuerunt coram justiciariis aliqui ad plus, aliqui ad minus, ita (quodⁱ) per retorum summonicionis de Scaccario quod vicecomes----eis fecit de predictis amerciamentis levandis infra libertatem Archiepiscopi, ipsi predictos Rogerum de Petra et alios pro predictis amerciamentis distrinxerunt per predictos equos et oves. Et hoc offerunt verificare (ad certum diemⁱ) per retorum summonicionis de Scaccario quod vicecomes--eis inde liberavit ideo datus est eis *die Martis* proximo quod tunc habeant retorum quod eis liberatum fuit de Summonicionis Scaccarii. Et similiter dictum est vicecomiti quod tunc habeat predictam summonicionem de predictis amerciamentis levandis. Set quod vi et armis et contra pacem non fecerunt predictum distrincionem ponunt se super patriam. Et predictus Ricardus de Sardene similiter deffendit quicquid est contra pacem. Et non cepit predictos equos nec predictas oves nec capcioni eorumdem inter fuit, ponit se super patriam. Et Rogerus de Petra et alii similiter, ideo fiat inde jurata. Et quia convictum est per xii juratores ad hoc electos quod predicti Henrici de Burne, Anselmus et Thomas Soreng' non ceperunt predicta averia contra pacem, set quod ea ceperunt per retorum summonicionis de Scaccario et sine aliqua violencia eis facta. Et etiam quod predictus Ricardus de Sardene non inter fuit illi distrincioni, consideratum est quod predicti Henricus de Burne et alii inde sine die. Et predicti Rogerus de Petra, Walterus Fyggard at alii in *miser cordia* pro falso clamore.
- Et super hoc veniunt ballivi Roff' Episcopi. Et dicunt quod Episcopus Roff' talem habet libertatem scilicet quod ipse et omnis predecessores sui a conquestu Anglie et ante et semper postea habuerunt omnia attachiamenta ad amerciamenta et omnia debita domini Regis in terris suis levanda quousque Archiepiscopus Cantuar' iam quatuor annis elapsis ipsum extra tenuit de predicta libertate. Et petunt hoc sibi emendiri. Ideo exspectent usque *die Martis* quando Archiepiscopus veniat.
- B217. Ralph of Bungeye complains against Henry of Bourne and Thomas Soranks that they came with force of arms to Trottiscliffe on the first Friday before the feast of Saint Bartholomew year 39 [20 August 1255] and there they seized seven of Ralph's sheep from the bishop of Rochester's pasture and led them away. They still detain them to Ralph's loss of 1 mark.
- Henry, Richard and the others come and deny force and injury. They readily maintain against them and their suit that they did they seize the horses and sheep with force of arms and against the peace. Henry of Bourne, Anselm of Maidstone and Thomas Soranks say that they were the archbishop of Canterbury's bailiffs. Roger of Petra and the others, who now complain about them, were amerced before the justices, some for a greater [amount] some for less. Thus, by the return of summons from the exchequer which the sheriff----- handed them [so as] to raise the aforesaid amercements from within the archbishop's liberty, they distrained

Roger of Petra and the others through the horses and sheep for the amercements. They offer to verify this on a certain day by the return of summons from the exchequer which the sheriff gave them. So a day is given them on the next *Tuesday* that then they shall have the return which was given to them from the summons from the exchequer. Likewise, it is said to the sheriff that he shall then have the summons for raising the amercements. That they did not come with force of arms and against the peace to make the distraint on this they place themselves on the country. Richard of Sarsden, likewise, denies whatever is against the peace. He neither seized the horses nor the sheep nor was he involved in their seizure. On this he places himself on the country. Roger of Petra and the others [do] likewise, so let there be a jury trial thereon. It is determined by 12 jurors chosen for this that Henry of Bourne, Anselm and Thomas Soranks did not seize the beasts against the peace, but they seized them by the return of summons from the exchequer. This was done without any violence. Also, Richard of Sarsden was not involved in that distraint. So it is adjudged that Henry of Bourne and the others are without a day. Roger of Petra, Walter Fyggard and the others [are] in *mercy* for false claim.

Concerning the above, the bailiffs of the bishop of Rochester have come. They say that the bishop of Rochester has a liberty as such; namely that he and all his predecessors from the conquest of England and before and always afterwards have had [the right] to raise all the attachments for amercements and all the king's debts on his [bishop's] lands, until the archbishop of Canterbury, some four years ago, deprived him of the liberty. They request that this be amended. So they shall wait until *Tuesday* when the archbishop shall come. [Cross-reference: ? B205, B214, B215, B216]

B218. Johannes de Haneworth' queritur de Nicholao de Lenham quod cum idem Johannes esset senescallus suus de omnibus terris ipsius Nicholai (per duos annos et dimidiamⁱ) et convenisset inter eos-----quod predictus Johannes debuisset recepisse ab eo per annum dum esset in servicio suo xl solidos. (Etⁱ) idem Johannes (mutuoⁱ) cepisset ad opus predicti Nicholai et per preceptum suum de quampluribus creditoribus pannos et alia estoveria ad valenciam xxxiii librarum de quibus in magna parte satisfecit eisdem creditoribus pro predicto Nicholao; Et idem Johannes accomodasset eidem Nicholao vii libras in denarios et amplius predictus Nicholaus non dum ei satisfecit de solucione predictorum xl solidorum per annum inqua ei tenetur de duobus annis et dimidia per quos stetit in servicio suo nec etiam de predicta pecunia quam pro eo soluit predictis creditoribus nec etiam de denariis quos ei accomodavit unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam L librarum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

dies datus est eis prece querentis a die Pasche in quindecim dies ubicumque H. le Bygod Justiciarius Anglie sit etc.

B218. John of Hanworth complains against Nicholas of Lenham that whereas John has been Nicholas' seneschal on all of Nicholas' lands for the past two and a half years, and they agreed that John ought to receive 40 shillings per year from him while he is in his service, and [whereas] John took on credit on Nicholas' behalf, and on his order, 33 pounds worth of bread and other allowances from several creditors for which John in the most part satisfied these creditors for Nicholas and [in addition] John [also] lent Nicholas 7 pounds and more in money; Nicholas has not yet paid him the 40 shillings in which he is held to him for two and a half years service, nor [has he paid] the money which he paid the creditors on his behalf nor the money which he lent him. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 50 pounds. Thereon he produces suit.

A day is given them on the prayers of both parties fifteen days from Easter [27 April 1259] wherever [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England is [to be found].

B219.(Essex') Willelmus le Seler filius Godebolt cognovit coram Egidio de Erdington' quod dedit et concessit Roberto de Trumpeton' unum mesuagium et totam terram suam cum pertinenciis quam habuit in Teye Godmere et in Aldham in Comitatu Essex'. Et idem Egidius testatur quod predictus Willelmus fecit hanc donacionem dum fuit compos mentis sue etc.

B219.(Essex) William le Seler son of Godebolt acknowledges before Giles of Erdington that he

gave and granted to Robert of Trumpington one messuage and all his land which he had in Mark Tey and in Aldam in the county of Essex. Giles testifies that William made this gift while he was of sound mind.

B220.(Suff) Radulfus de Monte alto petiit (die veneris proxima post Epiphaniam dominiⁱ) terram suam per plevinam que capta fuit in manum domini regis per defaultam quam fecit versus Johannem Welond' et habet.

B220.(Suffolk) Ralph of Mouhaut claims, on the first Friday after the Epiphany of the Lord, his land by pledge which was taken into the king's hand for a default which he had against John Weylond. He has it.

B221.(Ebor) Walterus de Grey petiit die dominica proxima post festum sancti Hillarii terram suam per plevinam que capta fuit in manum domini regis per defaultam quam fecit versus Willelmum filium Alani de Knapton'. Et habet.

B221.(Yorkshire) Walter de Grey claims, on the next Sunday after the feast of Saint Hillary his land by pledge which was taken into the king's hand for a default which he made against William son of Alan of Knapton. He has it.

[Membrane 12]

B222. Jurata xxiiii^{or} ----- ad convicendum xii^{cim} venit [ad] recognitura per Fulconum de Schersted', Reginaldum de Cornhull', Walterum de Bahull', Bartholomeum de Moriston', Johannem de Sancto Claro, Willelmum de Orlaueston' seniore, Alanum Pyrot, Henricum de Evering'. Radulfum Haket, Thomam filium Aucheri, Willelmum de Bodyham, Robertum de la Gare, Adam de Rixford', Willelmum de Dodmere, Henricum de Yldested', Robertum de Dene de Lenham, Lucium de Holingeburne, Jordanum Kok' de Lenham, Johannem Grang' de Lenham, Robertum de la Dene de Heriadesham, Thomam de Homershamme, Henricum de Thornhurst', Thomam de Schorne, Adam de Wyneston', Thomam de Laweye, Johannem de Selling', et Thomam de Capella si Willelmus Detling' injuste etc. disseysivit Thomam de Hoking' de libero tenemento suo in Detling' post primam etc. Et unde predictus Thomas alias coram Nicholao de Haulow justiciario domini Regis assignato ad assisam nove disseisine capiendam inde inter eos questus fuit quod predictus Willelmus disseysivit eum de xxviii^{to} acris terre cum pertinentiis etc. Et modo queritur quod juratores prefate assise falsum fecerunt sacramentum eo quod dixerunt quod predictus Willelmus non disseysivit eum de predicto tenemento eo quod idem Thomas [nunquam] fuit inde in seysina. Dicit enim quod (cumⁱ) ipse et antecessores sui per magnum tempus exstiterunt in seysina de predicto tenemento tenendo libere et in feodo de predicto Willelmo et antecessoribus suis predictus Willelmus in autumpno proximo preterito [leaves off abruptly]

Post venit predictus Thomas et retraxit se de brevi suo. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*⁵¹ scilicet Johannes de Thong' et Gerardus de Halingburne. Et Thomas committatur *gaole*.⁵² Post venit predictus Thomas et finem fecit per *xx marcas*⁵³ per plegium Dyonsi de la Bocland', Alani de Shoford', Walteri de Capillam, Ade de Lose, Johannis le Waleys, Dunstani le Waleys, Ade la Hylle, Henrici de la Sale, Ricardi de Geydeford', Willelmi de Greneweys, Laurencii le Fulur et Walteri de Capella de Lilinton' qui predictas *xx marcas* acquietabunt etc.

B222.[Kent] A jury of 24----- to attain 12 comes to declare by Fulk of Sharstead, Reginald of Cornhill, Walter of Bagshill, Bartholomew of Moriston, John of Saint Clair, William of Orlestone senior, Alan Perot, Henry of Everdean, Ralph Haket, Thomas son of Aucher, William of Bodenham, Robert de la Gare, Adam of Rishfords, William of Dodmere, Henry of Eleford, Robert of Dean from Lenham, Luke of Hollingbourne, Jordan Cook of Lenham, John

⁵¹Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁵²Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁵³Margin note by scribe, xx^{ti} m. crossed out.

Granger of Lenham, Robert de la Dean from Heriadesham, Thomas of Homersham, Henry of Thornhurst, Thomas of Thorne, Adam of Winson, Thomas of Laweye, Jordan of Selling and Thomas of Capella if William Detling disseised Thomas of Hockenden of his free tenement in Detling? Thomas, elsewhere before Nicholas of Hadlow, the king's justice assigned to the assize of novel disseisin taken between them, complained that William disseised him of 28 acres of land. He now complains that the jurors of the aforesaid assize swore a false oath, because they said that William had not disseised him of the tenement because Thomas was [never] in seisin. He says that whereas he and his ancestors for a long time stood in seisin of the tenement, holding it freely and in fee from William and his ancestors, William last autumn

Afterwards, Thomas comes and withdraws his writ. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely John of Tonge and Gerard of Hollingbourne. Thomas is to be committed to *gaol*. Afterwards, Thomas made fine for 20 marks by pledge of Denis de la Bocland, Alan of Shofford, Walter of Capella, Adam of Loes, John le Waleys, Dunstan le Waleys, Adam [de] la Hill, Henry de la Sale, Richard of Guildford, William of Greenway, Laurence le Fuller and Walter of Capella from Lillington who will acquit the 20 marks.

B223.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Isabella de Echam, Symon le seriaunt, Thomas de Esse, Willelmus le Seriaunt, Radulfus de Esse, Thomas frater eius, Willelmus le Wyte, Ricardus le Keu, Henricus le Say, Martinus le Chapeleyn et Galfridus le Chapellen injuste disseisiverunt Johannem de sancto Claro et Ramettam uxorem eius de libero tenemento suo in Stanstede post primam etc. Et unde predicti Johannes et Rametta queruntur quod predicti Isabella et alii disseisiverunt eos de L acris terre et iii^{or} acris bosci cum pertinenciis etc. Et Thomas de Esse venit et respondit pro se et omnibus aliis tamquam ballivus predictae Isabelle et dicit quod nullam injuriam fecerunt predictis Johanni et Ramette quia dicit quod revera predicti Johannes et Rametta aliquando tenuerunt predictum tenementum in feodo de predicta Isabella per servitium unius (dimidie¹) libre cymini per annum et faciendi sectam ad curiam ipsius Johanne de (Stanstede¹) de tribus septimanis in tres septimanas. Et quia predicti Johannes et Rametta subtarxerunt se de faciundo predictam sectam et similiter predictum redditum reddendo per magnum tempus, predicta (Johanna^S) per consideracionem curie sue saisivit predictum tenementum in manum suam secundum consuetudinem patrie et illud tenuit per unum annum et unum diem. Et postea quia predicti Johannes et Rametta infra annum et diem non satisfecerunt ei de predictis arreragiis nec etiam accesserunt ad eam ad faciendum ei servicia deibita de predicto tenemento; ideo secundum consuetudinem patrie illius detinuit ei predictam terram quousque satisfecerint etc.

Et predicti Johannes et Rametta bene deffendunt quod non licebat predictae Isabelle pro arreragio alicuius servicii saisire predictum tenementum in manum suam modo quo predictum est secundum consuetudinem patrie. Et preterea dicunt quod plenarie soluerunt ei predictum redditum (cymimi¹) de predicto tenemento debitum, set quo ad predictam sectam de tribus septimanis in Tres septimanas bene deffendunt quod nullam sectam debent pro predicto tenemento et de hoc ponunt se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera predicti Johannes et Rametta aliquando tenuerunt predictum tenementum in feodo de predicta Isabella per servitium dimidie libre cymini per annum. Et dicunt quod Thomas ballivus predictae Isabelle saisivit predictum tenementum in manum predictae Isabelle occasione cuiusdam arreragii predicti redditus secundum consuetudinem patrie. Et dicunt quod postmodum predicti Johannes et Rametta accesserunt ad predictum Thomam, ballivum predictae Isabelle et obtulerunt ei predictum redditum et similiter predicta arreragia. Set dicunt quod nec predicta Isabella nec predictus Thomas unquam postea voluerunt illum recipere. Set hucusque tenuerunt se in saysina de predicto tenemento et quandam partem bosci succiderunt unde dicunt quod predicti (Johanna^S), Thomas et alii injuste et sine iudicio eos inde disseisiverunt. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Johannes et Rametta recuperent saisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et (Johanna^S) et alii in *misericordia*.⁵⁴ *Dampna xl solidi*.

⁵⁴Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

B223.[Kent] (T) Did Isabel of Ethnam, Simon le serjeant, Thomas of Ash, William le Serjeant, Ralph of Ash, Thomas his brother, William le White, Richard le Cook, Henry le Say, Martin le Chaplain and Geoffrey le Chaplain disseise John of Saint Claire and Rametta his wife of their free tenement in Stansted? John and Rametta complain that Isabel and all the others have disseised them of 50 acres of land and 4 acres of wood. Thomas of Ash comes and answers for himself and all the others as Isabel's bailiff. He says that they made no injury to John and Rametta. He says in fact that John and Rametta once held the tenement in fee from Isabel by service of one pound of cumin per year and suit to John of Stansted's court every three weeks. Since, John and Rametta for a long time withdrew themselves from the suit and likewise the rent, [Isabel] by verdict of her court seized the tenement into her hand according to the custom of the country. She held it for a year and a day. Afterwards, since John and Rametta did not satisfy her for the arrears within the year and a day, nor did they approach her to make the service owed to her for the tenement, she, according to the custom of the country, withheld the land from them until they satisfied her.

John and Rametta readily maintain that Isabel is not permitted to seize the tenement into her hand for the arrears in service in the manner she has done. Moreover, they say that they have fully paid the rent of cumin owed to her for the tenement, but as regards the suit every three weeks, they readily maintain that no suit is owed for the tenement. On this they place themselves on the assize.

The jurors say that John and Rametta once held the tenement in fee of Isabel by service of a half pound of cumin per year. They say that Thomas, Isabel's bailiff, according to the custom of the country seized the tenement into Isabel's hand on the occasion of arrears in the rent. They say that afterwards John and Rametta approached Thomas and brought him the rent and the arrears. But, they say that neither Isabel nor Thomas wished to receive it, although to this point they have held themselves in seisin of the tenement and cut down part of the woods. Wherefore, they say that [Isabel], Thomas and the others have disseised them. So it is adjudged that John and Rametta recover their seisin. [Isabel] and the others [are] in *mercy*. *Damages: 40 shillings*.

B224.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Ricardus Digun pater Alani Digun et Galfridi fratris eius fuit seysitus in dominico etc. de una acra et tribus rodīs terre cum pertinenciis in Sneregate die quo etc. Et si obiit post ultimam etc. Et si etc. unde Agnes que fuit [uxor] Martini le Melkere tres rodas et dimidiam et Rogerus filius Martini tres rodas et dimidiam inde tenent. Qui veniunt. Et predicta Agnes dicit quod tenet predictas tres rodas terre et dimidiam in dotem de dono predicti Martini quondam viri sui. Et vocat inde ad warantum predictum Rogerum filium et heredem predicti Martini que presens est et ei warantizat et respondet de toto et quo ad medietatem predictae terre scilicet tres rodas et dimidiam dicit quod predicti Alanus et Galfridus nichil juris clamare possunt in predicta terra eo quod *Bastardi* sunt. Et ideo mandatum est B. Cantuar' Archiepiscopo quod convocatis coram eo etc. rei veritatem etc. Et quid inde etc. scire faciat etc.

Et de residuo predictae terre scilicet de tribus rodīs et dimidia vocat ad warantum Jacobum filium Thome Umfrey, Nicholaum, Thomam et Hamonem (fratris^s) eius ideo veniant *die Sabbati* proxima post festum sancti Vincentii.

Postea venerunt predicti Jacobus filius Thome Umfrey, Nicholaus, Thomam et Hamo fratres eius---et warantizant predicto Rogero predictas Tres rodas et dimidia et vocant inde ad warantum Sonier filius Martini. Habeant eum a die Pasche in tres septimanas apud *Westmonasterium* per auxilium curie. (Et summoneatur in Comitatu *Essex*.ⁱ) Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod habeat corpora recognitorum ad eundem terminum etc. Et predicti Alanus et Galfridus ponunt loco suo Jacobum de Sneregate'.

Postea in Octabis sancti Hillarii apud *Westmonasterium* mandavit B. Archiepiscopus Cant' per litteras suas patentes quod predicti Alanus et Galfridus sunt de legitimo matrimonio procreati. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Alanus et Galfridus recuperent seisinam suam de predictis tribus rodīs et dimidia cum pertinenciis. Et Rogerus in *misericordia* per plegium Jacobi de Sneregate'.

B224.[Kent] (T) Was Richard Digun father of Alan Digun and Geoffrey his brother seized in demesne of one acre and three rods of land in Snargate on the day? Agnes who was the

[wife] of Martin le Melkere holds three and a half rods, and Roger son of Martin holds three and a half rods. They come. Agnes says that she holds the three and a half rods in dower from a gift by Martin, once her husband. She calls to warrant Roger, Martin's son and heir. He is present. He warrants her and answers for all. As regards [his] half of the land, namely three and a half rods, he says that Alan and Geoffrey are able to claim nothing in the land because they are *bastards*. So [Boniface] Archbishop of Canterbury is instructed to convene before him [his court] to verify this. What thereafter [is determined] he shall make known.

Concerning the rest of the land, namely three and a half rods, he calls to warrant James son of Thomas Humfrey, Nicholas, Thomas and Hamo his brothers. So they shall come on the next *Saturday* after the feast of Saint Vincent [25 January].

Afterwards, James son of Thomas Humfrey, Nicholas, Thomas and Hamo his brothers come and they warrant Roger for the three and a half rods. They call to warrant Sonier son of Martin. They shall have him three weeks from Easter at *Westminster*, by aid of the court. He is to be summoned in the county of *Essex*. So the sheriff is ordered that he have the jurors bodies at that term. Alan and Geoffrey appoint as their attorney James of Snargate.

Afterwards, in the octaves of Saint Hillary [20 January] at Westminster, [Boniface] Archbishop of Canterbury answered by his letters patent that Alan and Geoffrey were begotten from a legitimate marriage. So it is adjudged that Alan and Geoffrey recover their seisin of the three and a half rods. Roger [is] in *mercy* by pledge of James of Snargate.

B225. Herewardus de la More et Hawysia uxor eius qui tulerunt juratam xxiiii^{or} ad convicendum xii^{cim} versus Robertum de Fortesham et alios in brevi de communa pastura in Rulvingden' non sunt prosecuti. Ideo ipsi et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*⁵⁵ scilicet Henricus de la More et Ricardus de Pettingden' etc.

B225.[Kent] Hereward de la More and Hawisia his wife, who brought a jury of 24 to attain 12 against Robert of Forsham and others named in the writ concerning common pasture in Rolvenden, have not prosecuted. So they and their pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely Henry de la More and Richard of Puttenden.

B226. Helewysia de Meyham ponit loco suo Herevium Barre versus Johannem de Cranewell' et alios in brevi de placito assise nove disseisine. Et versus Agatha de Kasingham et alios de placito transgressionis etc.

B226. Helewise of Maytham appoints as her attorney Harvey Barre against John of Cranwell and others named in the writ concerning a plea of novel disseisin and against Agatha of Kensham and others named in the writ concerning a plea of trespass.

B227.(Kant') Aluredus de Denne qui tulit juaratham xxiiii^{or} and convicendum xii^{cim} versus Rogerum de Ketmenistera de tenemento in Sybertesweld' venit et retraxit se. Ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*,⁵⁶ misericordia perdonatur per dominum Regem etc.

B227.(Kent) Alfred of Dane Court, who brought a jury of 24 to attain 12 against Roger of Kidderminster concerning a tenement in Sibertswold, comes and withdraws himself. So he and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. The amercement is pardoned by the king.

B228.(Suff') Johannes Welond' cognovit pro se et heredibus suis teneri Thome filio Aucheri in duabus marcis et dimidia argenti singulis annis eidem solvendis tota vita ipsius Thome in Prioratu sancte Trinitatis Lond' coram Sacrista vel Celerario eiusdem domus qui pro tempore fuerint, scilicet medietatem ad mediam Quadragesima et alteram medietatem ad festum sancte Margarete, sicut continetur in scripto quod idem Johannes (inde¹) fecit predicto Thome ----- . Et post decessum predicti Thome idem Johannes et heredes sui erunt quieti de solucione predictarum duarum marcarum et dimidie in perpetuum.

⁵⁵Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁵⁶Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

etc.

B228.(Suffolk) John Weylond acknowledges for himself and his heirs [that] he is held to pay Thomas son of Aucher two and a half silver marks each year for the rest of Thomas' life at the Priory of Saint Trinity London before the current sacristan or cellarer of the house, namely half in the middle of Lent and the other half at the feast of Saint Margeret, as is contained in the deed which John made to Thomas----- After Thomas' death, John and his heirs are quit of the payment of the two and a half marks in perpetuity.

B229.(Kant') Nicholaus de Lenham cognovit quod debet Gilberto filii Elye de Roff' Drapar' in novem libris et xii^{cim} solidis argenti de quibus ei reddet medietate (ad^c) die Martis proxima ante diem cynerum anno xliii. Et alteram medietatem ad mediam xl^am proximo sequentem. Et nisi fecerit; concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et custus et dampna etc.

B229.(Kent) Nicholas of Lenham acknowledges that he owes Gilbert son of Ellis of Rochester a draper, nine pounds and 12 shillings in silver concerning which he shall render him half on the first Tuesday after Ash Wednesday year 43 [11 March 1259] and the other half in the middle of the following Lent. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands, and [at his] cost and loss.

B230. Henricus de Burne in *misericordia*⁵⁷ pro transgressione.

B230.[Kent] Henry of Bourne [is] in *mercy* for a transgression.

B231. Magister Hospitale sancti Thome Cant' ponit loco suo Walterum Capella versus Rogerum de Somery de placito transgressionis.

B231.[Kent] The master of the Hospital of Saint Thomas of Canterbury appoints as his attorney Walter Capella against Roger of Sumery concerning a plea of trespass.

B232. Willelmus del Val' ballivus in *misericordia*⁵⁸ pro contemptu.

B232. William del Val' a bailiff [is] in *mercy* for contempt.

B233.(Kant') Nicholaus de Lenham cognovit quod debet Johanni de Norht' Civi London' septem libras et vii solidos quos ei reddet in Crastino Ascencionis domini anno xliii. Et nisi fecerit; concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et Custus et dampna etc.

B233.(Kent) Nicholas of Lenham acknowledges that he owes John of Northampton, a citizen of London, seven pounds and 7 shillings which he shall render to him on the morrow of the Assumption of the Lord year 43 [23 May 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands, and [at his] cost and loss.

Som' (Johannes^c) filius Martini in Essex'

Willelmus de Faukham Willelmus de Detling', Rogerus de Northwood'⁵⁹

Sonier son of Martin in Essex

William of Fawkham, William de Detling, Roger of Northwood

[Membrane 12]

Adhuc de Assisis

⁵⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵⁹This entry is to be found at the very foot of the membrane without an entry mark thus, ff.

Still Concerning Assizes

B234.(Kant', T) Ass. ven. rec. si Absolonus de Edelineston' avunculus Johanne (uxoris Johannisⁱ) filii Ricardi le Clerc fuit seiscitus in dominico suo etc. de sex acris terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis in Bocland et de uno mesuagio quatuor acris terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis in Dodeston' die quo etc. Et si etc. unde Henricus Lovell' et Ricardus Peyforer sex acras terre et dimidiam, Et Johannes de Edelineston' unum mesuagium et quatuor acras terre et dimidiam inde tenent. Qui veniunt. Et Johannes de predicta terra versus eum petita dicit quod assisa non debet inde fieri, quia bene cognovit quod predictus Absolonus de cuius morte etc. obiit seiscitus de eadem terra ut de feodo. Et post terminum etc. set dicit quod post mortem predicti Absolonis intravit ipse in predictam terram tamquam filius et heres ipsius Absolonis propinquior, unde petit iudicium desicut ipse est filius predicti Absolonis et clamat predictam terram eodem (desconsu^s) quo predicta Johanna; si assisa jacet inter ipsos. Et Henricus Lovell' et Ricardus Peyforer de terra versus eos petita dicunt quod predictus Johannes de Edelineston' adeo bene intravit predictam terram versus eos petitam post mortem Absolonis patris sui tamquam heres ipsius Absolonis quam terram versus eundem Johannem petitam. Et quod predictus Johannes fuit inde per magnum tempus in seysina ita quod cum processu temporis predictus Johannes non satisfecisset eidem Henrico qui est capitalis dominus feodi illius de servicio ei debito de predictis sex acris terre et dimidia, predictus Henricus secundum consuetudinem Kant' saisivit predictam terram in manum suam tenendam quousque satisfecisset ei de servicio ei debito et de arreragio. Et dicit quod postmodo venit predictus Johannes ad eundem Henricum et replegiavit terram (suamⁱ) et satisfecit ei de arreragiis suis, ita quod ipsemet Henricus reddidit ei terram suam. Et predicti Johannes et Johanna uxor eius requisiti si predictus Johannes de Edelineston' fuit in saisina de predictis sex acris et dimidia, dicunt quod sic. Et predictus Johannes de Edelineston' requisitus si velit respondere de predictis sex acris terre et dimidia, dicit quod sic. Et sponte respondet de predicta terra sicut superius respondet de predicta terra versus ipsum petita et petit iudicium desicut ipse intravit predictam terram post mortem Absolonis patris sui ut filius et heres ipsius Absolonis et clamat eodem descensu quo predicta Johanna; petit iudicium si assisa jacet inter eos etc.

Et predicti Johannes et Johanna dicunt quod predictus Johannes non potest clamare predictum terram per aliquem descensum de predicto Absolone quia dicunt quod non potest esse heres predicti Absolonis. Quia dicunt quod predictus Johannes (itaⁱ) bastardus est quod natus fuit ante quam predictus Absolonus pater suus desponsavit Aliciam matrem eius. Postea precise dicunt quod predictus Johannes *bastardus* est. Et ideo mandatum est B. Cantuar' Archiepiscopo quod convocatis coram eo etc. rei veritatem etc. Et quid inde etc. scire faciat per litteras etc.

Postea a die sancte Trinitatis in tres septimanas anno xliii apud Westmonasterium concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis quod predictus Johannes de Edelineston' recognovit predictam mesuagium et terram cum pertinenciis esse jus ipsius Johanne. Et illa eis reddidit in eadem curia. (Et sex acras terre et dimidiam de predicta terra cum pertinenciis remisit etc.ⁱ) Et pro hac etc. predicti Johannes et Johanna concesserunt eidem Johanni de Elineston' predicta mesuagium et quatuor acras terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis in Dodington', habenda et tenenda eidem Johanni et heredibus suis de predictis Johanne et Johanna et heredibus ipsius Johanne reddendo etc. unum denarium ad Pascha (pro omni servicio etc.ⁱ) et faciendo inde capitale domino etc. omnes alia servicia que ad predictum tenementum pertinent. Et predicti Johannes et Johanna et heredibus ipsius Johanna warantizabant etc. Et preterea habeant cyrographum etc.

B234.(Kent, T) Was Absolon of Ellington uncle of Joan wife of John son of Richard le Clerc seized in demesne of six and a half acres of land in Bocland and of one messuage and four and a half acres in Doddington on the day? Henry Lovel and Richard Payforer hold six and a half acres and John of Ellington one messuage and four and a half acres of land. They come. John, concerning the land sought against him, says that the assize ought not to be made since he readily acknowledges that Absolon died seized of the land as of fee and after the term [contained in the writ]. But he says that after Absolon's death, he entered the land as Absolon's nearest son and heir. Wherefore he seeks judgement if the assize runs between

them, since he is Absolon's son and claims the land by the same descent as Joan. Henry Lovel and Richard Payforer, concerning the land sought against them, say that John of Ellington, after Absolon's death, as Absolon's heir, rightly entered the land sought against them as well as the land sought against John. John was in seisin for a long time, thus in the course of time John did not satisfy Henry, who is the chief lord of that fee, for service owed to him from the six and a half acres. [Thus], Henry, according to the custom of Kent, seized the land into his hand to hold until he satisfied him for the service owed him and for the arrears. He says that afterwards John came and repledged his land to Henry and satisfied him of the arrears; thus Henry himself rendered the land to him. John and Joan his wife asked if John of Ellington was in seisin of the six and a half acres; they said yes. John of Ellington was asked if he wished to answer concerning the six and a half acres of land. He said yes. He freely answers concerning the land sought against him as above. He seeks judgement on this, that since he entered the land after his father's death as his son and heir and claims the same by the same descent as Joan ought the assize to run between them.

John and Joan say that John cannot claim the land by any descent from Absolon, since they say he cannot be Absolon's heir since he is a bastard, because he was born before Absolon married Alice his mother. Afterwards, they say exactly this, that John is a *bastard*. So [Boniface] Archbishop of Canterbury is instructed to convene before him [his court] to verify this. What [is deteremined] he shall make known by letters [patent].

Afterwards, three weeks from Trinitimas year 43 at Westminster, they were agreed by licence. The agreement is as such, that John of Ellington recognizes the messuage and land to be Joan's right. He rendered it to them in the same court. He remitted the six and a half acres of land to her. For this, John and Joan granted the messuage and the four and a half acres of land in Doddington to John of Ellington and his heirs to have and to hold of John and Joan and Joan's heirs, to render thereafter one pence at Easter for all service and to make to the chief lord [of that fee] all service which pertains to the tenement. John and Joan and Joan's heirs warrant etc. Let them have a chirograph.

B235. Ass. ven. rec. si Jordanus filius Ricardi le Clerk de Gravende injuste etc. disseisivit Willelmum filium Ricardi le Clerk de Gravend' de libero tenemento suo in Gravenel' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod predictus Jordanus disseisivit eum de una acra et dimidia et una roda terre cum pertinentiis etc. Et Jordanus venit et dicit quod predictus Willelmus nunquam fuit in saysina ut de libero tenemento quia dicit quod predictum Jordanum est unus heredem predicti Ricardi patris [sui] ita quod predictum tenementum cecidit predicto Jordano in propartem de hereditate predicti Ricardi. Et dicit quod predictus Jordanus dimisit predictam terram eidem Willelmo tenendam ad voluntatem suam de anno in annum. Et quod predictus Willelmus nunquam aliquod habuit liberum tenementum in predicta terra. Ita quod potuit inde (dissaisiri.^S) Et de hoc ponit se super assisam etc.

Et Willelmus dicit quod revera predicta terra cecidit predicto Jordano in propartem de hereditate predicti Ricardi patris sui, set dicit quod predictus Jordanus feofavit ipsum Willelmum de predicta terra et eam ei remisit et quietumclamavit de se et heredibus suis predicto Willelmo et heredibus suis et quandam cartam eidem Willelmo inde fecit de feofamento quam predictus Jordanus noluit sigillare, set quod predictus Jordanus feofavit ipsum de predicta terra. Et predictus Willelmus fuit inde in saisina per predictum feofamentum per ^v^{que} annos et amplius quousque predictus Jordanus ipsum injuste etc. disseisivit ponit se super assisam. Et hoc convictum est per assisam. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus recuperet saisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et predictus Jordanus in *misericordia*,¹ plegii de misericordia eius Johannes frater eius et Bartholomeus de Blen'. *Dampna xii solidi*.

B235.[Kent] Did Jordan son of Richard le Clerk of Gravesend disseise William son of Richard le Clerk of Gravesend of his free tenement in Graveney? He complains that Jordan disseised him of one and a half acres and one rod of land. Jordan comes and says that William was never in seisin of it as free tenement, since he says that Jordan is the sole heir of Richard their father. Thus, the tenement descended to Jordan as a share of Richard's inheritance. He says that Jordan demised the land to William to hold at his will year by year. William never had any free tenement in the land, so that he could be disseised. On this he places himself on the assize.

William says that the land descended to Jordan as a share of Richard's inheritance. But he says that Jordan enfeoffed him of the land and John remitted and quit claimed himself and his heirs to William and his heirs. [John then] made a charter of enfeoffment with William which Jordan did not wish to seal, but that Jordan enfeoffed him of the land. William was in seisin by the enfeoffment for 5 years and more until Jordan disseised him. On this he places himself on the assize. This is determined by the assize. So it is adjudged that William recovers his seisin. Jordan [is] in *mercy*. The pledges for his amercement [are] John his brother and Bartholomew de Blen. *Damages: 12 shillings*.

B236. Ass. ven. rec. si Walterus de Staunford, Willelmus Freman, Thomas de Orlagheston' capellanus et Albredas de Besford' injuste disseisiverunt Helewysiam de Plukele de libero tenemento suo in Plukele post primam etc. Et predicta Helewysa querit quod predicti Walterus et alii disseisiverunt eam de xvi acris terre cum pertinentiis etc. Et Walterus et Willelmus veniunt. Et Walterus dicit quod ipsamet est in seisina de xii acris terre (et dimidia¹) de predicta terre. Et quo ad tres acras eiusdem terre dicit quod ipsa similiter feoffavit ipsum de predictis tribus acris. Et de dimidia acra de predicta acra respondet predictus Willelmus et dicit quod predicta Helewisia que modo tulit assisam istam feoffavit predictam Albredam de eadem dimidia acra et eadem Albreda ipsum Willelmum. Et quod nullam aliam disseisinam ei fecerunt ponunt se super assisam. Et Thomas de Orlaweston' et alii non venerunt nec fuerunt attachiati quia non fuerunt inventi. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eos per defaltam.

Juratores dicunt quod predicti Walterus et Willelmus non disseisiverunt predictam Helewysiam de predictis xii acris terre et dimidia nec de predicta dimidia acra de qua idem Willelmus seperatim respondit, quia dicunt quod ipsamet Helewisa est in seisina de predictis xii acris terre et dimidia. Dicunt etiam quod predicta Helewisa feoffavit predictam Albredam

¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

de alia dimidia acra et eadem Albreda predictum Willelmum. Set dicunt quod predictus Walterus disseisivit predictum Helewisam de predictis tribus acris terre de quibus ipse clamabat feoffari injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicta Helewisa recuperet inde seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Walterus in *misericordia*.² Et Helewisa similiter in *misericordia*³ pro falso clamore versus eos de predictis xii acris terre et dimidia, pauper est. *Dampna. iii solidis sic remittuntur quia recepit iii^{or} solidos per quandam convencionem (indeⁱ) inter eos etc.*

B236.[Kent] Did Walter of Staunford, William Freeman, Thomas of Orleston a chaplain and Aubrey of Besford disseise Helewisie of Pluckley of her free tenement in Pluckley? Helewisie complains that Walter and the others disseised her of 16 acres of land. Walter and William come. Walter says that she herself is in seisin of 12 1/2 acres of land. As regards three acres of the land, he says that she likewise enfeoffed him of the three acres. Concerning a half acre of land, William answers and says that Helewisie, who brought this assize, enfeoffed Aubrey of the half acre and Aubrey [enfeoffed] William. That they made no other disseisin, on this they place themselves on the assize. Thomas of Orleston and the others have not come nor were they attached, since they were not found. So the assize is taken against them by default.

The jurors say that Walter and William have not disseised Helewisie of the 12 1/2 acres of land, nor of the half acre about which William answered for separately, since they say that Helewisie is in seisin of the 12 1/2 acres. They also say that Helewisie enfeoffed Aubrey of another half acre and Aubrey [enfeoffed] William. But, they say that Walter disseised Helewisie of three acres of which he claimed to be enfeoffed. So it is adjudged that Helewisie recovers her seisin. Walter [is] in *mercy*. Helewisie likewise [is] in *mercy* for false claim against them concerning the 12 1/2 acres of land. She is poor. *Damages: 3 shillings are remitted since she received 4 shillings through an agreement [made] between them.*

B237.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Isabella de Pyumton' et Willelmus de Wych' injuste etc. disseisiverunt (Goldeholdam uxoremⁱ) Eustachii de Barebinga (et Godeholdam uxore eius^{ul}) de libero tenemento suo in Farleya post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eam de viii^{to} acris terre cum pertinenciis. Et Isabella et Willelmus non venerunt nec fuerunt attachiati quia non fuerunt inventi. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eos per defaltam.

Juratores dicunt quod predicti Eustachius et Godeholda vendiderunt predicto Willelmo sexdecim acras terre cum pertinenciis in eadem villa que fuerunt de hereditate ipsius Godeholde pro xii marcis argenti quas idem Willelmus eisdem Eustachio et Godeholde solvere debuit ita tantum quod medietas predictae terre, scilicet predictae octo acre de quibus assisa ista arrainata est deberet remanere predictis Eustachio et Godeholde tota vita ipsius Godeholde postquam prefatus Willelmus per feoffamentum (ipsorumⁱ) Eustachii et Godeholde plenariam seisinam inde habuisset per xl dies. Et quia predictus Willelmus plenam seisinam inde habuit usque ad predictum terminum completum predicti Eustachius et Godeholda posuerunt se in seisina de predictis viii acris terre et de quadam domo existente super predictam terram et remanserunt in seisina de eisdem per unum diem et amplius quousque prefati Willelmus et Isabella eos inde eiecerunt. Post venit predicta Isabella que predictas viii acras terre (et predictam domumⁱ) tenet per feoffamentum predicti Willelmi et per licenciam reddit predictas octo acras terre cum pertinenciis et predictam domum predictis Eustachio et Godeholde tenendas eisdem Eustachio et Godeholde tota vita ipsius Godeholde de eadem Isabella et heredibus suis per servicium inde debitum. Et post decessum predictae Godeholde predictae viii acre terre et predicta domus cum pertinenciis revertentur predictae Isabelle et heredibus suis quiete de predictis Eustachiis et heredibus predictae Godeholde. Et preterea eadem Isabella cognovit quod reddet predictis Eustachio et Godeholde pro dampnis suis (et pro debito in quo predictus Willelmus eis tenebaturⁱ) xxii solidos ad festum Sancti Johannis Baptiste anno regno regis xliii. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes fieri faciat de terris etc. Et predicti Eustachius et Godeholda tenent se inde contentos etc.

²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B237.[Kent] (T) Did Isabel of Pointon and William of Wichling disseise Godeholda wife of Eustace of Barebinga of her free tenement in Farleigh? She complains that they have disseised her of 8 acres of land. Isabel and William have not come, nor were they attached because they were not found. So the assize is taken against them by default.

The jurors say that Eustace and Godeholda sold sixteen acres, which were from Godeholda's inheritance, to William for 12 silver marks which William ought to pay to Eustace and Godeholda. Thus, only that half of the land, namely the eight acres for which this assize is arraigned, ought to remain to Eustace and Godeholda for all of her life after William, by their enfeoffment, was in full seisin for 40 days. Since William had full seisin for the complete term, Eustace and Godeholda placed themselves in seisin of the 8 acres of land and a certain house and they remained in seisin for one day and more until William and Isabel ejected them. Afterwards, Isabel comes, who holds the 8 acres of land and the house by William's enfeoffment, and by licence renders the eight acres and the house to Eustace and Godeholda to hold for all of Godeholda's life from Isabel and her heirs by the service owed. After Godeholda's death, the 8 acres and the house are to revert to Isabel and her heirs quit of Eustace and Godeholda's heirs. Moreover, Isabel acknowledges that she shall render 22 shillings, at the feast of Saint John the Baptist regnal year 43 [24 June 1259], to Eustace and Godeholda for their damages and for the debt in which William is held to them. If she does not, she grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from her lands. Eustace and Godeholda hold themselves content.

B238.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus de la Grave pater Matilde de la Grave et Christine sorore eius fuit seisitus in dominico suo etc. de una acra terre cum pertinenciis in Pluckel' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Walterus Wlmer tenet. Et Walterus venit et bene cognovit quod predictus Willelmus fuit seisitus in dominico suo etc. de predicta terra die quo etc. et quod idem Willelmus obiit post terminum (etc.ⁱ) et quod predictae Matilda et Christina propinquiore eiusdem Willelmi heredes sunt. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictae Matilda et Christina recuperent seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Walterus in misericordia.

B238.(Kent) Was William de la Grave father of Matilda de la Grave and Christine her sister seized in demesne of one acre in Pluckley on the day? Walter Ulmer holds the land. Walter comes and readily acknowledges that William was seized of the land in demesne on the day and that William died after the term [contained in the writ] and that Matilda and Christine are William's nearest heirs. So it is adjudged that Matilda and Christine recover their seisin. Walter [is] in mercy.

B239.(Kant') Agnes de Pyrie ponit loco suo Willelmum de Apelton' vel Stephanum de Braburne versus Johannem de Stake et alios in brevi de placito assise mortis antecessoris etc.

B239.(Kent) Agnes of Pirie appoints as her attorneys William of Appleton and Stephen of Brabourne against John of Stake and others named in the writ concerning a plea of mort d'ancestor.

[Membrane 13]

Adhuc de Assisis et Juratis apud Cantuar'

Still Concerning Assizes and Jury-Pleas at Canterbury

B240.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Leveredus filius Ricardi frater Willelmi filii (Ricardiⁱ) (Leveredi^{ul}) fuit seisitus in dominico suo ut de feodo de duabus acris terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis in Adinton' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Walterus de Burne tenet. Qui venit. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit quod predictus Willelmus alias tulit assisam mortis antecessoris versus quandam Galienam Dauntmartin de isto eodem tenemento coram G. de Preston' et sociis suis iusticiariis itinerantibus. Ita quod idem Willelmus remisit

et quietum[clamavit] de se etc. predicte Galiene et heredibus et assignatis suis totum jus et clameum quod habuit in predicta terra imperpetuum. Et (dicitⁱ) eadem Galiene postea feoffavit ipsum Walterum de eadem terra. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera quod predictus Leveredus de cuius morte etc. obiit seisis de predicta terra in dominico suo etc. et post terminum et quod predictus Willelmus propinquior heres eius est, sed dicunt quod idem Willelmus postea tulit quandam assisam mortis (antecessorisⁱ) de predicta terra versus predictam Galienam Daummartin coram G. de Preston' et sociis suis ita quod idem Willelmus remisit et quietumclamavit de se et heredibus suis predicte Galiene et heredibus suis et assignatis totum jus et clameum quod habuit in predicta terra cum pertinenciis pro duabus marcis et uno quaterio ordeï que predicta Galiene ei dedit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Walterus inde sine die. Et Willelmus nichil capiat per assisam istam et sit in *misericordia* pro falso clamore.

B240.(Kent) Was Leofric son of Richard brother of William son of Richard seized in demesne of two and a half acres in Addington on the day? Walter of Bourne holds the land. They come and say nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says that William, elsewhere, before [Gilbert] de Preston and his colleagues, justices itinerant, brought an assize of mort d' ancestor against Gale Dammartin concerning this same tenement. Thus, William remitted and quit claimed himself to Gale and her heirs and assignees of all right and claim which he had in the land, in perpetuity. He says that afterwards Gale enfeoffed him of the land. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that Leofric died seized of the land in his demesne and after the term [contained in the writ], and that William is his nearest heir. But, they say that before [Gilbert] de Preston and his colleagues William brought an assize of mort d' ancestor against Gale Dammartin concerning the land. Thus, William remitted and quit claimed himself and his heirs to Gale and her heirs and assignees all right and claim which he had in the land for two marks and one quarter of barley which Gale gave him. So it is adjudged that Walter is without a day. William takes nothing by this assize and is in *mercy* for false claim.

B241.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Thomas le Chapeleyn avunculus Rogeri filii Stephani qui infra etatem est ut dictur fuit seisis in dominico suo etc. de medietate unius mesuagii et quatuordecim acris terre cum pertinenciis in Netherhardres die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam medietatem mesuagium et quam terram Cecilia que fuit uxor Ade le Bret tenet. Que venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Thomas de cuius morte etc. obiit seisis de predictis tenementis ut de feodo et post terminum et quod predictus Rogerus propinquior heres eius est. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Rogerus recuperet seisinam suam per visum regonitorum. Et Cecilia in *misericordia*.⁴

B241.(Kent) Was Thomas le Chaplain uncle of Roger son of Stephen, who is under age as said, seized in demesne of half of one mesuage and fourteen acres of land in Lower Hardres on the day? Cecilia who was the wife of Adam le Breton holds the messuage and land. She comes and says nothing to stop the assize.

The jurors say that Thomas died seized as of fee and after the term [contained in the writ] and Roger is his nearest heir. So it is adjudged that Roger recovers his seisin. Cecilia ia in *mercy*.

B242.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Petrus Buho injuste etc. disseisivit Thurstanum de North Den' de libero tenemento suo in Rodmeresham post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de dimidia acra bosci et de quodam gardino quod continet circiter dimidiam acram cum pertinenciis, Et Petrus venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit quod predictus Thurstanus ipsum inde feoffavit per cartam suam quam profert et que hoc testatur. Et Thurstanus dicit quod qualemcumque cartam predictus Petrus proferat sub nomine suo ipse tum nunquam feoffavit ipsum de predictis tenementis, nec predictam cartam ei (indeⁱ) confecit. Et si unquam confecta fuisset, hoc fuit ipso nesciente dum fuit (in^s) compos mentis

⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

sue et gravi morbo detentus. Et de hoc petit assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Thurstanus aliquo tempore dimisit predicto Petro duas acras terre sue ad terminum septem annorum pro xxxvi solidis quos ei dedit, et postea in processu temporis venit idem Petrus et tantum locutus fuit cum predicto Thurstano quod idem Thurstanus (ipsum¹) feoffare debuit de predictis bosco et gardino et etiam de predicta terra quam prius ei dimiserat ad terminum pro x marcis argenti quas predictus Petrus ei dedit et i marca de qua idem Petrus satisfecit cuidam Stephano pro predicto Thurstano. Ita tantum quod predicti xxxvi solidos allocati fuerunt in predicto debito. Et dicunt quod idem Petrus inde confecit predictam cartam dum fuit compos mentis sue licet fuisset egrotans, sed dicunt quod idem Thurstanus nullam seisinam fecit predicto Petro (de predictis bosco et gardino¹) post confeccionem predictae carte immo idem Petrus auctoritate propria posuit se in seisina de eisdem tenementis unde dicunt quod predictus Petrus disseisivit predictum Thurstanum de predictis bosco et gardino injuste etc. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Thurstanus recuperet seisinam [suam] per visum recognitorum. Et Petrus in *miserecordia*.⁵

Postea convenit inter eos scilicet quod predictus Thurstanus concessit eidem Petro predictas duas acras terre cum pertinentiis tenendas eidem Petro et heredibus suis de predicto Thurstano etc. per servicium unius denarii redditus per annum et faciendo dominis feodi omnia alia servicia etc. Et preterea idem Thurstanus dat predicto Petro xliii solidos quos ei reddet ad medietatem quadragissima. Et pro hac etc. predictus Petrus remisit et quietumclamavit de se etc. predicto Thurstano et heredibus suis totum jus etc. quod habuit in predictis bosco et gardino et etiam xiii denariis redditus et omnibus aliis rebus contentis in predicta carta prius (inde¹) confecta. Et predictus Thurstanus confecit eidem Petro quamdam cartam de predictis duabus acris tantum. Et alia carta cancelata est etc.

B242.[Kent] (T) Did Peter Buho disseise Thurstan of North Dean of his free tenement in Rodmersham? He complains that he has disseised him of a half acre of wood and a certain garden which contains about a half acre. Peter comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says that Thurstan enfeoffed him by his charter, which he produced and in which this is testified. Thurstan says that no matter what charter Peter produced under his name he never enfeoffed him of the tenements, nor did he confer a charter to him. If it was ever conferred this was unbeknownst to him and while of [un]sound mind and gravely ill. On this he seeks the assize.

The jurors say that Thurstan at one time demised two acres of his land to Peter for the term of seven years for 36 shillings which Peter gave him. During the course of time Peter came and persuaded Thurstan to enfeoff him of the wood and garden and also of the land which he had previously demised for the term, for 10 silver marks which Peter gave him and for 1 mark which Peter satisfied Stephen on Thurstan's behalf. Thus, the aforesaid 36 shillings were allocated towards the debt. They say that Peter thereafter made a charter while he was of sound mind, although he was ill, but they say that Thurstan made no seisin to Peter concerning the wood and garden after drafting the charter. Rather, Peter on his [own] authority placed himself in seisin of the tenements. Wherefore, they say that Peter disseised Thurstan of the wood and garden. So it is adjudged that Thurstan recovers his seisin. Peter [is] in *mercy*.

Afterwards, it [is] agreed between them that Thurstan grant the two acres of land to Peter for Peter and his heirs to hold of Thurstan by service of one pence per year and to make to the lords of the fee all other service [which is owed for that tenement]. Moreover, Thurstan gives Peter 43 shillings which he shall render at Lent. For this, Peter remits and quitclaims himself to Thurstan and his heirs of all right which he had in the wood and garden and also in 13 pence rent and all other things disputed in the previously made charter. Thurstan conferred to Peter a charter concerning only the two acres. The other charter is cancelled.
[Cross-references: B254]

B243.(Kant', T, ad iudicium) Ass. ven. rec. si Mabilia de Bedrinden injuste disseisivit Hamonem Curtehos' de libero tenemento suo in Sandhurst post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de dimidia acra prati cum pertinentiis (de qua Theynwynus filius eiusdem

⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Mabilie ipsum feoffavit.¹⁾ Et Mabilia non venit sed Tuberdus de Merden' ballivus eius venit et respondet pro ea. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicit quod ipsa Mabilia dotata fuit de predicta dimidia acra prati post mortem cuiusdam Johannis quondam viri sui. Ita quod ipsa permisit quendam Theynwynum filium suum falcare predictam (dimidiam¹⁾) acram per tres annos vel quatuor eo quod adjacebat alteri dimidie acre quam idem Theynwinus tenuit de hereditate predicti Johannis patris sui et dicit quod ipsa aliquando asportavit fenum suum crescens in predicta dimidia acra aliquando percepit ipsa denarios a predicto Theynwino filio suo pro predicto feno, absque aliqua seisina quam predictus Theynwinus inde habuit ita quod ipsum Hamonem vel aliquem alium inde potuit feoffare. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Et Hamo dicit quod predictus Theynwynus feoffavit ipsum de predicta acra prati semul cum quadam alia dimidia acra adjacente per cartam suam, et quod ipse per feoffamentum illud stetit in seisina iam per tres annos ut de libero tenemento suo, donec predicta Mabilia ipse inde eiecit. Et de hoc petit assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera predicta Mabilia dotata fuit de predicta acra prati cum pertinenciis de qua predictus Hamo queritur se disseisivit, et dicunt quod Theynus filius eiusdem Mabilie per tres annos vel quatuor falcavit eandem dimidiam acram prati ex permissione ipsius Mabilie matris sue. Ita quod idem Theynwinus quolibet anno satisfacit predictae Mabilie de feno crescente in predicta dimidia acra prati aliquando in denarios, aliquando asportando fenum et post fenum asportatum, habuit ipsa Mabilia communam suam in eodem prato, et depasta fuit herbagium cum averiis suis. Et dicunt quod predictus Theywinus postea feoffavit predictum Hamonem de eadem dimidia acra prati per cartam suam iam tribus annis elapsis qui per feoffamentum predictum stetit in seisina donec predicta Mabilia ipsum inde eiecit. Et juratores quesiti si predictus Theywinus feoffaverat predictum Hamonem de predicto prato sciente predicta Mabilia et si constabat vicinis et compatriotis de predicto feoffamento dicunt quod sic. [leaves of abruptly]

B243.(Kent, T, to judgement) Did Mable of Bedrinden disseise Hamo Curthose of his free tenement in Sandhurst? He complains that she has disseised him of a half acre of meadow of which Theywine, Mable's son, enfeoffed him of. Mable has not come, but Thurber of Marden, her bailiff, comes and answers for her. He says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says that Mable was dowered of the half acre of meadow after the death of John, once her husband. Thus, she allowed Theywine, her son, to mow the half acre for three or four years becuase it adjoined another half acre which Theywine held from John's inheritance. He says that she sometimes carried off her hay on the half acre and at other times she collected money from Theywine for the hay, without Theywine having had any seisin so that Hamo or anyone else could be enfeoffed. On this she places herself on the assize.

Hamo says that Theywine, by his charter, enfeoffed him of the half acre of meadow along with another half acre adjoining it. He by that enfeoffment stood in seisin of it as of his free tenement for the last three years, until Mable ejected him. On this he claims the assize.

The jurors say that Mable was dowered of the acre of meadow about which Hamo complains he has been disseised. They say that Theywine for three or four years mowed the half acre of meadow with Mable's permission. Thus, Theywine each year satisfied Mable for the hay on the half acre sometimes in money and at other times by carring off the hay. After the hay was carried off Mable had her common on the meadow and the pasture was depastured by her beasts. They say that afterwards Theywine, by his charter, enfeoffed Hamo of the half acre of meadow, Hamo, by the enfeoffment, stood in seisin for the past three years until Mable ejected him. The jurors [were] asked if Theywine had enfeoffed Hamo of the meadow with Mable's knowledge and if she agreed as a neighbour and compatriot to the enfeoffment, they said yes.

B244.(Kant',T) Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus de Elmherst, Willelmus de Tytinden' Wydo le Bedel et Walterus de Elmherst injuste etc disseisiverunt Thomam de Suterrencre et Albredam uxorem eius de libero tenemento suo in Eiarton' post primam etc. Et unde queruntur quod disseisiverunt eos de tribus acris terre cum pertinenciis. Et Willelmus de Elmherst et Willelmus de Tytinden' veniunt et nichil dicunt quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod predictus Willelmus de Tytinden' dicit quod predicti Thomas et Albreda spontanea (volunte^s)

eorum dimiserunt ei predictam terram. Ita quod ipse de bona voluntate ipsorum intravit in eandem terram et non per aliquam disseisinam. Et de hoc ponunt se super assisam. Et Wydo et Walterus non venerunt. Et Walterus fuit attachiatus per Willelmum de Edeste et Robertum de Elmherst ideo (ipsi^s) in *miserecordia*.⁶ Et Wydo non fuit attachiatus quia non fuit inventus. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eum per defaultam.

Juratores dicunt quod quedam convencio dudum facta fuit inter predictum Willelmum de Elmherst et predictos Thomam et Albredam in ultimo itinere justiciariis in comitatu isto, scilicet quod predicti Thomas et Albreda (reddidisseⁱ) (dimississe^{ul}) debuerunt eidem Willelmo predictam terram cum pertinentiis occasione cuiusdeam placiti moti inter eos coram prefatis justiciariis, vel si non, quod darent eidem Willelmo dimidiam marcam nomine pene. Et dicunt quod quia predicti Thomas et Albreda reddere noluerunt eidem Willelmo predictam terram venit predictus Willelmus de Tytindem tunc ballivus et cepit quandam inquisitionem auctoritate sua de predicta convencione. Ita quod idem Willelmus capta inquisicione eiecit predictos Thomam et Albredam de predicta terra et posuit predictum Willelmum de Elmhurst in seisinam de eadem et nichilominus cepit ab eis predictam dimidiam marcam, unde dicunt quod predicti Willelmus et alii disseisiverunt predictos Thomam et Albredam de predicto tenemento injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Ideo consideratum est quod Thomas et Albreda recuperent seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Willelmus et alii in *miserecordia*.⁷ *Dampna. vi solidi, iiii^{or} denarii.*

B244.(Kent, T) Did William of Elmhurst, William of Tinton, Guy the Beadler and Walter of Elmhurst disseise Thomas of Surrenden and Aubrey his wife of his free tenement in Eiarton? They complain that they have disseised them of three acres. William of Elmhurst and William of Tinton come and say nothing to stop the assize, except only that William of Tinton says that Thomas and Aubrey of their own free will demised the land to him. Thus, he with their own good will entered the land and not by disseisin. On this they place themselves on the assize. Guy and Walter have not come. Walter was attached by William of Edeste and Robert of Elmhurst, so he [is] in *mercy*. Guy was not attached since he was not found. So the assize is taken against them by default.

The jurors say that an agreement was made between William of Elmhurst and Thomas and Aubrey on the occasion of a plea taken between during the last eyre of the justices in this county, namely that Thomas and Aubrey ought to render the land to William and if not then they ought to give William a half mark as a penalty. They say that since Thomas and Aubrey did not wish to render the land to William, William of Tinton, then the bailiff, came and carried out an inquiry concerning the agreement, on his own authority. Thus, William carried out the inquiry and ejected Thomas and Aubrey from the land and placed William of Elmhurst in seisin. Nevertheless, he took the half mark from them. Wherefore, they say that William and the others disseised Thomas and Aubrey of the tenement. So it is adjudged that Thomas and Aubrey recover their seisin. William and the others [are] in *mercy*. *Damages: 6 shillings, 4 pence.*

B245. Ass. ven. rec. si Robertus filius Michaelis frater Johannis filii Michaelis fuit seysitus in dominico suo etc. de uno mesuagio et tribus acris terre cum pertinentiis in Sturmuth' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quod mesuagium et quam terram Maria de Valoynes tenet. Que venit et dicit quod predictus Johannes nichil juris clamare potest in predicta terra de morte predicti Roberti. Quia dicit quod predictus Michaelis pater ipsorum Roberti et Johannis habuit duas uxores scilicet quandam uxorem Emmam nomine secundam uxorem eius de qua procreavit precitum Robertum de cuius morte etc. et quasdam Margeriam et Matildam que adhuc vivunt. Et quandam Estrildam primam uxorem eius de qua procreavit predictum Johannem qui tulit assisam istam. Et desicut predictae Margeria et Matilda sunt sorores predicti Roberti de eodem patre et matre et predictus Johannes est frater ipsius Roberti de patre tantum, petit iudicium utrum predictae Margeria et Matilda sunt propinquiore heredes predicti Roberti vel predictus Johannes. Et si predictus Johannes aliquid clamore possit in predicta terra de morte predicti Roberti in vita predictarum Margerie et Matilde. Et Johannes non potest hoc

⁶Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁷Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

dedicere. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Johannes nichil capiat per assisam istam set sit in *misericordia*⁸ pro falso clamore etc.

B245.[Kent] Was Robert son of Michael brother of John son of Michael seized in demesne of one messuage and three acres of land in Stourmouth on the day? Mary of Valoines holds the messuage and land. She comes and says that John is able to claim no right in the land from Robert's death. Since she says that Michael, their father, had two wives, namely Emma his second wife from whom he begat Robert, Marjery and Matilda who still live and Estrilda, his first wife, from whom he begat John, who brought this assize. As Marjery and Matilda are Robert's sisters of the same father and mother and John is Robert's brother from only the father's side, she seeks judgement whether Marjery and Matilda are Robert's nearest heirs or [whether] John [is], and if John is able to claim the land as a result of Robert's death during Marjery's and Matilda's lifetime. John cannot deny this. So it is adjudged that John takes nothing by this assize. He is in *mercy* for false claim.

B246. Ass. ven. rec. si Radulfus Pakz pater Ricardi Pakz et Willelmi fratris eius fuit seysitus in dominico suo etc. de tribus scriis terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis in Terstane die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Gilbertus ad la More tenet qui venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat ideo capiatur assisa.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Radulfus pater predictorum Ricardi et Willelmi obiit seysitus de predicta terra ut de feodo. Et post terminum in brevi contentum. Et quod predicti Ricardus et Willelmus sunt heredes eius propinquiores. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Ricardi et Willelmi recuperent saisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Gilbertus in *misericordia*.⁹

B246.[Kent] Was Ralph Pakz father of Richard Pakz and William his brother seized in demesne of three and a half acres of land in Teston on the day? Gilbert ad la More holds the land. He comes and says nothing to stop the assize. So the assize is taken.

The jurors say that Ralph died seized of the land as of fee and after the term contained in the writ. Richard and William are his nearest heirs. So it is adjudged that Richard and William recover their seisin. Gilbert [is] in *mercy*.

B247.(Kant') Matilda que fuit uxor Bartholomei de Batdeslemere ponit loco suo Johannem de Cue versus Paganum le Cutyller et Editham uxorem eius de placito assise mortis antecessoris.

B247.(Kent) Matilda who was the wife of Bartholomew of Bradlesmere appoints as her attorney John of Kew against Pagan le Cutiller and Edith his wife concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor.

[Cross-reference: B257]

B248.(Kant') Abbas de Faversham ponit loco suo fratrem Walterum Celerarium suum et Salemanus le Bedel' versus Ricardum de Grey et alios de placito de transgressione.

B248.(Kent) The abbot of Faversham appoints as his attorneys Walter, his cellarer and Saleman the Beadler against Richard de Grey and others named in the writ concerning a plea of trespass.

[Cross-reference: B375]

B249.(Kant') Henricus de Pecham capellanus ponit loco suo Radulfum de Ditton' versus Reyne de Ditton' de placito assise mortis antecessoris.

B249.(Kent) Henry of Peckham a chaplain appoints as his attorney Ralph of Ditton against Reyner of Ditton concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor.

⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

(unge^s) id est billa¹⁰
Join, that is the bill.

[Membrane 13d.]

Adhuc de Assisis et Juratis apud Cantuar'

Still Concerning Assizes and Jury-Pleas at Canterbury

B250.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Magister Hospitalie (sancte Marieⁱ) de Strodes' injuste etc. disseisivit Ricardum le Chapeler de libero tenemento suo in Strodes' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod predictus Magister disseisivit eum de dimidia acre terre cum pertinenciis etc. Et Magister venit [et dicit] quod nullam injuriam fecit predicto Ricardo quia dicit quod ipsemet magister dimisit predictam terram cuidam Stephano le Coliere tenendam sibi et heredibus suis de se procreatis. Ita quod (siⁱ) obiret sine herede de se predicta terra reverteretur predicto magistero, unde dicit quod quia predictus Stephanus obiit sine (herede etc.ⁱ) ipse intravit in predictam terram secundum tenorem predictae dimissionis absque hoc quod predictus Ricardus vel aliquis alius aliquam inde seysinam haberet etc.

Et Ricardus dicit quod predictus Stephanus le Coliere cui predictus magister terram illam dimisit feofavit ipsum de predicta terra et ipsum (indeⁱ) in plena saysina posuit. Ita quod ipse per feoffamentum predicti Stephani fuit in saisina de predicta terra per magnum tempus quousque predictus magister injuste etc. inde disseisivit. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera predictus magister dimisit predicto Stephano predictam acram terre ut predictam est tenendam sibi et heredibus suis de se procreatis. Ita quod [si] obiret sine herede de se predicta terra reverteretur predicto magistero. Et dicunt quod cum predictus Stephanus neccesse compulsus mutuo acceperet de quodam Ada (le Munerⁱ) unum quaterum ordeum et invenisset predictum Ricardum le Chapeler' in plegio predictus Stephanus obligavit predictam terram predicto Ricardo per sic quod deveniret plegius suus versus predictum Adam ad acquietandum ipsum versus predictum Adam de predicto ordeo, set dicunt predictus Stephanus nichilominus remansit in saisina de predicta terra. Ita quod idem Stephanus processu temporis tradidit predictam terram cuidam Ricardo de Bleseby ad seminandum pro medietate fructuum unde dicunt quod post mortem predicti Stephani qui obiit sine herede de se predictus magister intravit in predictam terram absque hoc quod predictus Ricardus aliquam inde saisinam haberet. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Ricardus nichil capiat per assisam istam, set sit in *miserecordia*¹¹ pro falso clamore etc.

B250.[Kent] (T) Did the master of the Hospital of Saint Mary of Strood's disseise Richard le Chapeler of his free tenement in Strood? He complains that the master has disseised him of a half acre of land. The master comes and says that he made no injury to Richard, since he says that he himself demised the land to Stephen le Collier to hold himself and the heirs begotten by him. Thus, if he should die without an heir the land would revert to the master. Wherefore, he says that since Stephen died without an heir he entered the land according to the conditions of the demise, without Richard or anyone else having had seisin.

Richard says that Stephen le Collier, to whom the master demised the land, enfeoffed him of the land and he was placed in full seisin. Thus, by Stephen's enfeoffment, he was in seisin of the land for a long time, until the master disseised him. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that the master demised the land to Stephen to hold himself and his heirs begotten of him. Thus should he die without heir the land would revert to the master. They say that Stephen was forced out of neccesity to accept a loan of one quarter of barley from Adam le Miller and Stephen found Richard as his pledge. Stephen mortgaged the land to

¹⁰The following is at the very foot of the membrane without an entry mark thus *ff*. In addition there is a horizontal slit a half inch long just above this phrase. For an important analysis of this entry and accompanying slit see the chapter entitled The Documents.

¹¹Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

Richard on condition that he become his pledge against Adam to acquit him against Adam of the barley. But, they say Stephen, nevertheless, remained in seisin of the land. Thus, Stephen during the course of time surrendered the land to a certain Richard of Belesby to sow [in return] for half the harvest. Wherefore, they say that after Stephen's death, who died without heir, the master entered the land without Richard having had seisin. So it is adjudged that Richard takes nothing by this assize, but is in *mercy* for false claim.

B251.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes de Crioll' injuste etc. disseisivit Simonem de Wahull' de libero tenemento suo in Hardres post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisivit eum de xl acris terre, xx solidatis redditus et tercia parte unius molendino ad ventum cum pertinenciis. Et unde dicit quod quidam Willelmus de Hardres cuius jus et hereditas predicta tenementa fuerunt habuit quandam uxorem Aliciam nomine que eadem tenementa tenuit nomine dotis post mortem predicti Willelmi viri sui. Et dicit quod idem Willelmus habuit tres filias, scilicet quasdam Ceciliam, Isabellam et Agnetem matrem ipsius Simonis qui unus heredum predicti Willelmi esse debet. Ita quod ipse post mortem predictae Agnete intravit ipse in predicta tenementa ut in illa que ei descendebant in proparte sua de hereditate (predicti Willelmi¹) et inde fuit in seisina quousque predictus Johannes ipsum inde eiecit. Et Johannes venit et dicit quod (assisa¹) non debet inde fieri quia dicit quod predicta Agnes mater ipsius Simonis et una participium predictae hereditate feoffavit quandam Johannem de Hestron de tota proparte sua eiusdem hereditate quam tenuit in predicta villa de Hardres cum omnibus pertinenciis simul cum wardibus et eschaetis et omnibus aliis rebus que inde accidere potuerunt. Et idem Johannes feoffavit inde eodem modo Rogerum de Leburn'. Et idem Rogerus ipsum Johannem. Et dicit quod post mortem predictae Alicie intravit ipse in totum illud tenementum quod eadem Alicia tenuit nomine dotis in eadem villa scilicet, in sexies viginti acris terre, lx^a solidatas redditus et unum molendinum cum pertinenciis, et postmodo assignavit predictis Cecilie et Isabelle propartes suas predictorum tenementorum, scilicet duas partes et terciam partem sibi reservavit ((il) xl acras terra, xx solidatas redditus et tercia pars molendino¹) tamquam assignatum predictae Agnete unius participis predictae hereditate, unde dicit quod nunquam aliqua pars predictorum tenementorum assignata fuit predicto Simoni, nec aliquam seisinam unquam inde habuit. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et quod ita sit ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predicta tenementa aliquo tempore fuerit jus et hereditate predicti Willelmi patris predictarum Cecilie, Isabelle (et Agnete¹) et dotavit inde predictam Aliciam uxorem suam pro tercia parte ipsam contingente de tota hereditate ipsius Willelmi in villa de Hardres. Ita quod post mortem ipsius Willelmi partita fuit tota hereditas predicti Willelmi excepta dote ipsius Alicie mater predictas Ceciliam, Isabellam et Agnetem matrem predicti Simonis. Et dicunt quod postea in processu temporis feoffavit predicta Agnes predictum Johannem de Estron' de tota proparte sua in predicta villa, simul cum omnibus que inde accidere potuerunt et idem Johannes predictum Rogerum de Leyburn' et idem Rogerus eodem modo feoffavit postea predictum Johannem de Crioll' qui inde fuit in plenaria seisina vivente predicta Alicia. Et (dicunt quod¹) post mortem ipsius Alicie que obiit circa horam primam intrusit se predictis Simonis in predictum molendinum (circa horam nonam¹) et quamcito proveniebat ad noticiam ballivi predicti Johannis venit idem ballivus et inde eum eiecit et postea in contingati venit predictus Simo cum quadam ulga et succidit quandam partem cuiusdam haye in predicto tenemento et idem ballivus eum devadiavit, nec permisit ipsum aliquid inde asportare. Et hic crastino venit iterum predictus Simo cum caruca sua et arriavit in diversis locis infra predictam terram et predictus ballivus (statum supervenit et¹) amovit carucam illam et ipsum impedit quominus seisina aliqua uti potuit. Et juratores quesiti si predictus Simo unquam scivit propartem suam de predictis tenementis que predicta Alicia tenuit nomine dotis, vel si propars sua unquam fuisset ei assignata post mortem predictae Alicie, dicunt quod non. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Johannes inde sine die. Et Simo nichil capiat per assisam istam. Et sit in *misericordia*¹² pro falso clamore.

B251.(Kent) Did John of Crioil disseise Simon of Wahull of free tenement in Hardres? He

¹²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

complains that he has disseised him of 40 acres of land, 20 shillings rent and a third part of one windmill. He says that William of Hardres whose right and inheritance the tenements were had a wife, Alice by name, who held the tenement as her dower after William's death. He says that William had three daughters, namely Cecilia, Isabel and Agnes, Simon's mother who ought to be an heir of William. Thus after Agnes' death, he entered the tenement as that which descended as his share from William's inheritance. He was in seisin until John ejected him. John comes and says that the assize ought not to be made. Since he says that Agnes, Simon's mother and one shareholder in the inheritance, enfeoffed a certain John of Estron' of all of her part of the inheritance which she had in the vill of Hardres with all appertances, wards and escheats and all other things which could befall it. John, thereafter, enfeoffed Roger of Leybourne in the same manner and Roger [enfeoffed] John. He says that after Alice's death he entered the entire tenement which Alice held as her dower in the vill, namely one hundred acres of land, 60 shillings rent and one mill. Afterwards, he assigned Cecilia and Isabel their shares of the tenements, namely two parts and a third part [and] he reserved for himself () 40 acres of land, 20 shillings rent and a third part of the mill, as well as assignement Agnes a share of the inheritance. Wherefore, he says that no part of the tenement was assigned to Simon, nor did he ever have any seisin, so that he could be disseised. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that the tenement was once the right and inheritance of William father of Cecilia, Isabel and Agnes. He dowered Alice, his wife, with a third part of the entire inheritance concerning his inheritance in the vill of Hardres. Thus, after William's death the entire inheritance was divided up, except Alice's dower. They say that in the course of time Agnes enfeoffed John of Estron' of all of her share in the vill along with all which befell it. John [enfeoffed] Roger of Leybourne and Roger enfeoffed John of Criol in the same manner, who was in full seisin outliving Alice. They say that after Alice's death, who died around the hour of prime, Simon, around midday, entered himself in the mill. Immediately after John's bailiff learned of the news he came and ejected him. Afterwards, Simon came and with a knife cut down part of hedge on the tenement. The bailiff attached him, nor did he allow him to carry any off. Meanwhile, on the morrow Simon came with his plough and plowed in various places on the aforesaid land. The bailiff within his right came and removed that plough and impeded him from being able to make use of any seisin. The jurors were asked if Simon ever knew he had a share of the tenement which Alice held as her dower, or if his shares were ever assigned to him after Alice's death; they said no. So it is adjudged that John is without a day. Simon takes nothing by this assize and is in *mercy* for false claim.

[Cross-reference: B252]

B252.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si. Willelmus de Wahull' pater Simonis de Wahull' fuit seisitus in dominico suo etc. de uno mesuagio cum pertinentiis in Hardres die quo etc. Et si etc. Quod mesuagium Johannes de Crioll' tenet. Qui venit et vocat inde ad warrantum Rogerum de Leyburn' habeat eum *die sabbati* per auxilium curiam.

B252.(Kent) Was William of Wahull father of Simon of Wahull seized in demesne of one messuage in Hardres on the day? John of Criol holds the messuage. He comes and calls Roger of Leybourne to warrant. He shall have him on *Saturday* by aid of the court.

[Cross-reference: B251]

B253. Alicia de Helles queritur de Radulfo de Aksted' quod idem Radulphus minabatur ei de vita et menbris et inde producit sectam. Et Radulphus presens invenit hos plegios de pace domini regis scilicet, Rolandum de Aksted', Bartholomeum de Moriston', Walterum de Sancto Johanne, Thomam Abbelyn, Ricardum de Bynnee, Petrum Dudeman et Radulphum de Sancto Johanne. Qui manuceperunt pro eo quod decetero malum non (eveniet^s) predictae Alicie per predictum Radulphum. Ideo conceditur ei firma pax.

B253.[Kent] Alice of Hills Court complains against Ralph of Oxted that Ralph threatened her life and limbs. On this she produces suit. Ralph is present and he finds these pledges for the king's peace, namely Roland of Oxted, Bartholomew of Moriston, Walter of Saint John, Thomas Abbelyn, Richard of Binney, Peter Dodman and Ralph of saint John who undertake for him that henceforward no ill [shall befall] Alice through Ralph. So a firm peace is granted

to her.

- B254.(Kant') Thurstanus de Northdane cognoscit quod dedit et concessit etc. Petro de Buho (deas^s) acras terre cum pertinenciis in villa de Rodmersham unde una acra jacet juxta boscum predicti Thurstani versus austrum et una acra jacet juxta terram predicti Petri versus orientem tenendas etc. predicto Petro etc. de predicto Thurstano etc. reddendo inde i denarium per annum. Et faciendo capitali dominis feodi omnia alia servicia etc. Et Thurstanus et heredes sui warrantant etc.
- B254.(Kent) Thurstan of North Dean acknowledges that he gave and granted to Peter Buho two acres of land in the vill of Rodmersham wherefore one acre lies next to Thurstan's wood towards the south and one acre lies next to Peter's land towards the east for Peter to hold of Thurstan to render 1 pence per year and to make to the chief lords of the fee all other service [owed for that tenement]. Thurstan and his heirs warrant etc.
[Cross-reference: B242]
- B255.(Kant') Lucia de Fughelston' ponit loco suo Ricardum de Wadeton' versus Michaellem Tovy de placito transgressionis.
- B255.(Kent) Lucy of Folkeston appoints as her attorney Richard of Watton against Michael Tovy concerning a plea of trespass.
- B256.(Kant', T) Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus le Fyn avunculus Willelmi filii Ricardi fuit seisis in dominico suo etc. de quinque acris terre cum pertinenciis in Milsted' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Phillipus de Cenegfold' et Auelina uxor eius tenent. Qui veniunt et dicunt quod non debent ei inde ad hoc breve respondere, quia dicunt quod predictus Ricardus (paterⁱ) ipsius Willelmi et frater predicti Willelmi de cuius morte etc. comisit feloniam ob quam subtraxit se et utlagatus fuit. Et desicut ipse nichil juris clamare potest in predicta terra de seisina predicti Willelmi avunculi sui nisi ratione predicti Ricardi patris sui utlagati petunt iudicium si heres predicti Willelmi vel alicuius alterius esse possit. Et predictus Willelmus non potest hoc dedicere. Ideo consideratum est quod predicti Phillipus et Auelina inde sine die. Et Willelmus nichil capiat per assisam istam. Et sit in *misericordia*¹³ pro falso clamore.
- B256.(Kent, T) Was William le Fin uncle of William son of Richard seized in demesne of five acres of land in Milsted on the day? Philip of Cheneyfield and Auelina hold the land. They come and say that they ought not to answer this writ, since they say that Richard, William's father and William's brother concerning whose death [this assize is arraigned] committed a felony as a result of which he fled and was outlawed. As a result he is able to claim nothing by right in the land from his uncle William's seisin, except by reason of his father an outlaw, they seek judgement if William's heir or any other is able [to claim]. William cannot deny this. So it is adjudged that Philip and Auelina are without a day. William takes nothing by this assize and is in *mercy* for false claim.
- B257. Ass. ven. rec. si Hamo de Norton' pater Edithe uxor Petri le Cutiller fuit seysitus in dominico suo etc. de uno mesuagio et tribus acris terre cum pertinenciis in Nortone die quo etc. Et si etc. Quod mesuagium et quam terram Matilda que fuit uxor Bartholomei de Badelemere tenet. Et Matilda non venit etc. Et fuit resummonitus. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eam per defaltam etc.
- Juratores dicunt quod predictus Hamo de cuius morte etc. non fuit seysitus de predictis mesuagio et terre (die quo etc.ⁱ) Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Petrus et Editha nichil capiant per assisam istam, set sunt in *misericordia*¹⁴ pro falso clamore.
- B257.[Kent] Was Hamo of Norton father of Edith wife of Peter le Cutiller seized in demesne of one messuage and three acres in Norton on the day? Matilda who was the wife of

¹³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁴Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

Bartholomew of Bradelmere holds the messuage and land. Matilda has not come. She was resummoned. So the assize is taken against her by default.

The jurors say that Hamo was not in seisin of the messuage and land on the day. So it is adjudged that Peter and Edith take nothing by this assize, but they are in *mercy* for false claim.

[Cross-reference: B247]

B258. Johannes de Tonge in *misericordia*¹⁵ pro transgressionem.

B258. John of Tonge [is] in *mercy* for a transgression.

B259. Lambertus de Chekeshull' in *misericordia*¹⁶ quia non est executus preceptum domini regis.

B259. Lambert of Chekeshull [is] in *mercy* since he did not carryout the king's order.

[Membrane 14]

Adhuc de Assisis et Juratis apud Cantuar'

Still Concerning Assizes and Jury-Pleas at Canterbury

B260.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes filius Rogeri de Herste injuste etc. disseisivit Thomam filium Rogeri de Herste et Henricum fratrem eius de libero tenemento suo in Pitte post primam etc. Et unde queruntur quod disseisivit eos de duabus partibus septem acrarum terre et dimidie cum pertinentiis. Et Johannes venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicit quod ipse successit Rogero de Herste patri suo in predicto tenemento ut in illo quod idem Rogerus pater eius perquisierat de quodam Willelmo de Pitte qui tenementum illud tenuit per servitium militare et predictus Rogerus similiter absque aliqua proparte quam predicti Thomas et Henricus habuerint vel habere potuerunt in eodem tenemento post mortem predicti Rogeri patris ipsorum.

Et Thomas et Henricus dicunt quod predictus Rogerus pater ipsorum tenuit predictam terram per servitium gavelikend' de predicto Willelmo. Ita quod post mortem predicti Rogeri fuerunt in seisin de predictis duabus partibus predictae terre tamquam in custodia cuiusdam Elene matris ipsorum eo quod ipsi sunt infra etatem, quousque predictus Johannes ipsos inde eiecit. Et de hoc petunt assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod Rogerus pater predictorum Johannis et aliorum tenuit predictum tenementum de predicto Willelmo de Pytte per servitium militare et quod predictus Johannes post mortem eiusdem Rogeri patris ipsorum intarvit in predictam terram immediate absque aliqua seisinam quam predicti Thomas et Henricus inde habuerint. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Johannes inde sine die. Et Thomas et Henricus nichil capiant per assisam istam. Et ipsi sunt infra etatem.¹⁷

B260.(Kent) Did John son of Roger of Hurst disseise Thomas son of Roger of Hurst and Henry his brother of his free tenement in Pett? They complain that he has disseised them of two parts of seven and a half acres of land. John comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says that he succeeded Roger of Hurst, his father, in the tenement as that which Roger had acquired from William of Pett who held the tenement by military service. Roger [held it] likewise, without any share which Thomas and Henry may have had or are able to have in the tenement after their father's death.

Thomas and Henry say that Roger held the land in gavelkind of William. Thus after Roger's death, they were in seisin of the two parts of the land as well as [being] in the custody of Ellen, their mother, because they are under age, until John ejected them. On this they seek the assize.

¹⁵Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

¹⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁷Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

The jurors say that Roger held the tenement from William of Pett by military service and John entered the land immediately after Roger's death without any seisin which Thomas and Henry may have had. So it is adjudged that John is without a day. Thomas and Henry take nothing by this assize. They are under age.

B261. Fulco Peyforer vicecomes in *misericordia*¹⁸ eo quod non respondet de attachiamento et pro aliis transgressionibus.

B261.[Kent] Fulk Payforer, sheriff, [is] in *mercy* because he did not answer concerning an attachment and for other transgressions.

B262. Alicia de Helles queritur de Matilde de Asted', Johanne Beneyt, Johanne filio Humfridi, Radulpho de Asted', Johanne filio Michaeli, Willelmo Mustard' et Nicholao de Tywelested' quod ipsi simul cum Willelmo de Braunton', Willelmo le seriant de la Denne, Henrico Ingerman et aliis die Mercurii in festo Sancti Stephani anno xlii "venerunt" vi et armis ad domum que fuit Reginaldum de Cobeham in Pecham et de bonis ipsius Alicie ibidem inventis ceperunt unum forcarium cum sex anulis auries, viii¹⁰ coeliaria argentea, duos cyphos argenteos, duos cyphos de mazera, pannos, lineos, et laneos, panem, carnem, et alia bona ad valenciam x marcarum asportaverunt et devastaverunt et homines ipsius Alicie ibidem inventos verberaverunt et maletractaverunt contra pacem etc. unde dicit quod deteriorata est et dampnum habet ad valenciam x librarum et inde producit sectam.

Et Matilda et omnes alii veniunt et defendunt vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendunt quod ipsi predicto die non venerunt vi et armis ad predictam domum, nec aliqua bona ibidem ceperunt nec asportaverunt vel devastaverunt, nec etiam aliquem hominum ipsius Alicie verberaverunt, nec maletractaverunt contra pacem etc. Et de hoc ponunt se super patriam. Et Alicie similiter.

Eadem Matilda queritur de predicta Alicia et Alexandera clerico de Helles quod ipsi die Lune in crastino Concepcionis Beate Marie eodem anno vi et armis venerunt ad quandam grangiam quam eadem Matilda tenuit ex permissione predicti Reginaldi de Cobeham in Pecham et fenum ipsius Matilde in eadem grangia conculcaverunt ad valenciam lx^a solidorum et asportaverunt. Et in vigilia Nativitatis Domini eodem anno venerunt ad molendinum ipsius Matilde in eadem villa et ferrum eiusdem et duos bussellos bladi in eodem molendino inventos ceperunt et asportaverunt contra pacem etc. Unde dicit quod deteriorata est et dampnum habet ad valenciam centum solidorum. Et inde producit sectam.

Et Alicia et Alexanderus veniunt et defendunt vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendunt quod ipsi predicto die non venerunt ad predictas domos nec aliquem transgressionem ibidem fecerunt, sed predicta Alicia dicit quod revera predicta tenementa tenentur de ea et dicit quod quia servicia inde ei (debitum^s) a retro fuit de multo tempore transacto seisivit ipsa predicta tenementa in manum suam pro suis arreragiis secundum consuetudinem Kant' eo quod tenentur de ea in gavelikend'. Et quod nullam aliam transgressionem ei fecit ponit se super patriam. Et Matilda similiter.

Et juratores de consensu parcium electi dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predicti Radulfus de Asted', Johannes Beneyt et Nicholaus de Tywelested' ex precepto predictae Matilde vi et armis venerunt ad predictam domum et quandam Alexanderum hominem ipsius Alicie in eadem domo inventum verberaverunt et maletractaverunt et etiam panem et cervisiam et carries in eadem ceperunt et devastaverunt, sed dicunt quod jocalia nec bona ibidem ceperunt nec asportaverunt, nec quod predicti Johannes filius Humfridi et alii inter fuerunt predictae transgressionis faciendae. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Matilda, Radulfus, Johannes et Nicholaus committantur *gaole*.¹⁹ Et predicta Alicia recuperet dampna sua que taxantur ad ii solidos. Et sit in *misericordia*²⁰ pro falso clamore versus alios.

Et quo ad querelam predictae Matilde dicunt quod revera quod predicta domus et molendino tenentur de predictae Alicia et quia ei a retro fuit servitium debitum, ideo distrinxit ipsa predictam Matildam per ferrum eiusdem molendini, set dicunt quod predicta Alicia non

¹⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

²⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

cepit predictos duos busselos bladi in predicto molendino, nec quod asportavit predictum fenum, dicunt enim quod ipsa devastavit eodem feno ad valenciam iiii^{or} solidorum. Ideo predicta Alicia satisfaciat ei de predictis iiii^{or} solidis et sit in *misericordia*²¹ pro transgressione. Et predicta Matilda similiter in *misericordia*²² pro falso clamore versus eam de predicto blado.

B262.[Kent] Alice of Hills Court complains against Matilda of Oxted, John Benet, John son of Humfrey, Ralph of Oxted, John son of Michael, William Mustard and Nicholas of Tywelested that they along with William of Brampton, William le serjeant de la Dean, Henry Ingerman and others came with force of arms on the Wednesday during the feast of Saint Stephen year 42 [25 December 1258], to the house which was Reginald of Cobham's in Peckham and from Alice's goods found there they seized one strong box with six gold rings, 8 pieces of silver jewelry, two silver cups, two cups of maplewood, cloth, linen, wool, bread, meat and other goods worth 10 marks. They carried it off and destroyed [the house] and beat and maltreated Alice's men found there against the peace. Wherefore, she says that she has suffered damage to the value of 10 pounds. Thereon she produces suit.

Matilda and all the others come and deny force and injury. They readily maintain that on that day they did not come with force of arms to the aforesaid house, nor did they seize nor carry off any goods found there, nor did they destroy it, nor did they beat or maltreat any of Alice's men against the peace. On this they place themselves on the country. Alice [does] likewise.

Matilda complains against Alice and Alexander clerk of Hills Court that they on the Monday on the morrow of the Conception of the Blessed Mary of the same year came [9 December 1258] with force of arms to a grange which Matilda held by permission of Reginald of Cobham in Peckham and they trampled down Matilda's hay in the grange, worth 60 shillings, and they carried it off. On the vigil of the Nativity of the Lord of the same year [24 December 1258] they came to Matilda's mill in the vill and seized and carried off the mill's iron and two bushels of grain found in the mill. Wherefore, she says she had suffered damage to the value of one hundred shillings. Thereon she produces suit.

Alice and Alexander come and deny force and injury. They readily maintain that on the aforesaid day they did not come to the building, nor did they carryout any transgression. But, Alice says that in fact [Matilda] holds the tenement of her and she says that since the service owed to her was in arrears for a long time, she seized the tenement into her hands for the arrears according to the custom of Kent, because Matilda holds of her in gavelkind. That she made no transgression to her on this she places herself on the country. Matilda [does] likewise.

The jurors elected by both parties say upon their oath that Ralph of Oxted, John Benet and Nicholas of Tywelested, on Matilda's orders, came with force of arms to the house and they beat and maltreated Alexander, one of Alice's men, found in the house. They also seized bread and ale and devastated the carts, but they say that they did not seize and carry off jewelry or goods, nor was John son of Humfrey or the others involved in the transgression. So it is adjudged that Matilda, Ralph, John and Nicholas are to be committed to *gaol*. Alice recovers her damages which was assesed at 2 shillings. She is in *mercy* for false claim against the others.

As regards Matilda's complaint they say that in fact she holds the house and mill of Alice and since she was in arrears for service owed, so she distrained Matilda by the iron from the mill. But, they say that Alice did not seize the two bushels of grain, nor did she carry off the hay. They also say that she devastated the hay to the value of 4 shillings. So Alice shall satisfy her concerning the 4 shillings and she is in *mercy* for the transgression. Likewise, Matilda [is] in *mercy* for false claim against her concerning the grain.

B263. Bartholomeus de Overle qui tulit assisam nove disseisine versus Priorem Sancte Trinitatis Cantuar' de communa pasture in Longebach' venit et retraxit se ideo prior inde sine die. Et

²¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

predictus Bartholomeus et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*.²³ Et remittatur misericordia.

Postea convenit inter eos-----quod predictus Bartholomeus remisit et quietumclamavit de se et heredibus suis predicto priori et successoribus suis totum jus et clameum quod habuit vel habere potuit exigendi communam vel aliquid aliud juris in toto bosco de Langelege inperpetuum. Et pro hac etc. predictus prior concessit pro se et successoribus suis predicto Bartholomeo et heredibus suis quinquaginta acras terre cum pertinentiis que apellantur le Hok' et que se extendit versus boscum Cantuar' Archiepiscopi qui vocatur Ryssemere et stratum regiam qua itur versus Cantuar' habendas et tenendas predicto Bartholomeo et heredibus suis de predicto priore et successoribus suis simul cum tota alia terre quam predictus Bartholomeus prius tenuit de predicto priore per servicium decem solidorum per annum et per servicium faciendi sectam ad curiam prioris apud Cantuar' quater per annum ad rationabilem summonitum. Et predictus prior remisit predicto Bartholomeo et heredibus suis sectam cum aliis serviciis et consuetudinibus quam ad curiam predicti Prioris de Welles facere consuevit pro toto tenemento quod antea tenuit de predicto priore. Et pro hac etc. predictus Bartholomeus dedit predicto priori xl^a marcas etc.

- B263. Bartholomew of Oversley, who brought an assize of novel disseisin against the prior of Saint Trinity Canterbury concerning common pasture in Longbeech, comes and withdraws his suit. So the prior is without a day. Bartholomew and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. The amercement is remitted.

Afterwards, it [was] agreed between them ----- that Bartholomew remit and quitclaim himself and his heirs to the prior and his successors of all right and claim which he had or is able to demand in the common or any other right in the whole wood of Langley, in perpetuity. For this, the prior grants, for himself and his successors, Bartholomew and his heirs fifty acres of land, which is called 'le Hook', and which extends from the archbishop of Canterbury's wood called 'Ryssemere' to the royal way which leads from Canterbury, to have and to hold of the prior and his successors along with all the other land which Bartholomew previously held of the prior, by service of ten shillings per year and by service of suit at the prior's court at Canterbury four times a year at reasonable summons. The prior remits to Bartholomew and his heirs the suit with the other services and customs which he was accustomed to make to the prior of Welles court for the whole tenement which he previously held of the prior. For this, Bartholomew gave the prior 40 marks.

- B264. Johannes de Crioll' summonitus fuit ad respondendum Henrico Malemeyns de placito quod reddat ei viginti marcas quas ei debet etc. Et Johannes venit. Et concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis, scilicet quod predictus Henricus remisit eidem Johanni quinque marcas de predicto debito. Et pro hac etc. Idem Johannes cognoscit se debere predicto Henrico residuum predicti debiti, scilicet xv marcas de quibus reddet ei vi marcas die Jovis proxima ante Purificacionem Beate Marie et ix marcas ad festum Sancti Johannis Baptiste. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

- B264.[Kent] John of Crioil was summoned to answering Henry Malesmains concerning a plea that he would render him twenty marks which he owed him. John comes. They are agreed by licence. The agreement is as such; namely that Henry remits to John 5 marks of the aforesaid debt. For this, John acknowledges that he owes Henry the rest of the debt, namely 15 marks of which he shall render 6 marks to him on the first Thursday after the Purification of the Blessed Mary [6 February 1259] and 9 marks at the feast of Saint John the Baptist [24 June]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

- B265. Willelmus le Cluse cognovit quod debet Symoni de Cantuar' capellano xii^{cim} libras quas ei reddet ad Pascham anno xliii. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et remittit ei residuum debiti in quo ei tenebatur etc.

²³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B265.[Kent] William le Cluse acknowledges that he owes Simon of Canterbury, a chaplian, 12 pounds which he shall render to him at Easter year 43 [13 April 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands. He remits the rest of the debt in which he is held to him.

B266.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes de Watton', Robertus Doy, Saerus de Newton', Thomas filius Malle et Hamo Dudeman injuste etc. disseysiverunt Dyonisiam de Urndal' de libero tenemento suo in Neuton' post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod predicti Johannes et alii disseisiverunt eam de quinquaginta acris terre et medietate quinque acrarum bosci et triginta solidis redditus cum pertinenciis etc. Et predicti Johannes, Saerus et Thomas veniunt et dicunt quod nullam injuriam fecerunt predictae Dyonisie quia dicunt quod predicta Dyonisia aliquando tenuit predictum tenementum nomine franci banci sui. Et dicunt quod predicta Dyonisia processu temporis in vidutate sua pregnans fuit et peperit. Ita quod ipsa ob hoc summonita fuit ad curiam de Midelton' et ibi inculpata. Et cum sufficienter in predicta curia probatum esset ipsam fecisse partum in vidutate sua predicta Dyonisia secundum consuetudinem hundredi de Midelton' (et¹) per (judicium¹) consideracionem eiusdem curie amisit predictam terram quam tenuit nomine franci (baci^s). Et quod ita sit ponit se super assisam. Et (predictus¹) Robertus Doy (et Hamo¹) non venerunt nec fuerunt attachiati eo quod non fuerunt inventi. Ideo capiatur assisa versus (eum^s) per defaultam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera quidam avunculi filiarum ipsius Dionisie quarum hereditatem ipsa tenuit in custodia et unde dotata fuit questi fuerunt ballivo de Middelton' de hoc quod peperisse debuit post mortem viri sui in soinantagium per quod amittere debuit dotem suam qua occasione summonita fuit ad curiam de Middelton' ad quam venit et requisita si vellet se inde ponere super patriam, dixit quod non debuit nec voluit ibi respondere de libero tenemento suo nec in aliquam inquisicionem se ponere nisi esset summonita per breve domini regis et inde recessit. Et ballivus de Middelton' in absencia ipsius Dionisie per testimonium duarum mulierum scilicet quarundam Gunnore de Neuton' et Luticie de Chehull' que dicebant inter fuisse partui predictae Dionisie in quodam celarium apud Wormendal' processit ad predictam inquisicionem capiendam per consideracionem predictae curie per quam hoc idem convictum fuit. Ita quod per iudicium eiusdem curie consideratum fuit quod predicta Dionisia amitteret predictam dotem suam, set quod inde sustentaretur per visum et liberationem predicti ballivi. Et dicunt quod predictus ballivus cepit seisinam de predicto tenemento ad opus domini regis et inde remeneat in seisina et invenit inde predictae Dionisie sustentacionem suam quousque quidam Mathias et Gilbertus servientes Johannis de Wadeton' ex precepto predicti Johannis eiecerunt quandam servientem predicti ballivi cui commiserat custodiam predicti tenementi. Et quia convictum est quod predicta Dionisia per consideracionem et iudicium predictae curie amisit predictam dotem suam et non sine iudicio consideratum est quod ipsa nichil capiat per assisam istam set sit in *miserordia*²⁴ pro falso clamore. Et Johannes et alii que ad hoc inde sine die. Et predicti Mathias, Gilbertus et Johannes in *miserordia*²⁵ pro transgressione. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat in crastino totam predictam curiam de Middelton' ad faciendum recordum illud etc.

B266.[Kent] (T) Did John of Watton, Robert Doy, Saier of Newington, Thomas son of Malle and Hamo Dodman disseise Denise of Wormdale of her free tenement in Newington? She complains that John and the others have disseised her of fifty acres of land and half of five acres of woods and thirty shillings rent. John, Saier and Thomas come and say that they did no injury to Denise, since they say that Denise once held the tenement as her free bench. They say that Denise in the course of her widowhood became pregnant and gave birth. Thus, on account of this she was summoned to the court of Milton Regis and there charged. Since it was proven to enough members of the court that she had given birth in her widowhood, Denise, according to the custom of the hundred of Milton Regis and by judgement of the court, surrendered the land which she held as her free bench. On this he places himself on the assize. Robert Doy and Hamo have not come, nor were they attached because they were

²⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²⁵Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

not found. So the assize is taken against them by default.

The jurors say that Denise's uncles' daughters, whose inheritance she holds in custody and was dowered [of], complained to the bailiff of Milton Regis concerning this that Denise gave birth in concubinage after her husband's death for which she ought to lose her dower. On the occasion when she was summoned to the court of Milton Regis to which she came and was asked if she wished to place herself on the country, she said that she ought not, nor wishes to answer there concerning her free tenement nor place herself on any inquiry unless she was summoned by a royal writ. Thereafter she left. The bailiff in Denise's absence proceeded to take the inquiry through the testimony of two women, namely Gunnora of Newington and Lucy of Chehull, who said Denise gave birth in a cellar in Wormdale, by consideration of the court this was determined. Thus by verdict of the court it was adjudged that Denise should lose her dower, but thereafter she should be sustained by view and delivery of the bailiff. They say that the bailiff took seisin of the tenement for the king's benefit and he remained in seisin and found Denise her sustenance, until Mathias and Gilbert, John of Watton's serjeants, on John's order, ejected one of the bailiff's serjeants who had custody of the tenement. Since it is determined that Denise by consideration of the court and judgement of the court lost her dower and not without judgement, [so] it is adjudged that she takes nothing by this assize but is in *mercy* for false claim. John and the others are without a day. Mathias, Gilbert and John [are] in *mercy* for the transgression. The sheriff is ordered that he make come on the morrow the whole court of Milton Regis to make that record. [Cross-reference: B290]

B267.(Kant') Dionisia filia Willelmi de Thorenton' ponit loco suo Edmundum de Dale versus Simonem Dunning' et Ricardum filium Elye de placito transgressionis.

B267.(Kent) Denise daughter of William of Thornden appoints as her attorney Edmund of Dale against Simon Dunning and Richard son of Ellis concerning a plea of trespass.

B268. Dies datus est Simoni filio Ade querenti et Johanni de Rokele de placito custodie in octabis Purificacionis ut de die in diem etc.

B268. A day is given Simon son of Adam, the plaintiff, and John of Ruxley concerning a plea of custody in the octaves of the Purification from day to day. [Cross-reference: B422]

[Membrane 14d.]

Adhuc de Assisis et Juratis

Still Concerning Assizes and Jury-Pleas

B269.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Prior Sancti Martini de Dovere, frater Johannes de Norflete et Elyas de Munteny injuste etc. disseisiverunt Johannem Mansell' thesauriatum Ebor' de libero tenemento suo in Wortle post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod predicti prior et alii disseisiverunt eum de vi marcis redditus, ducentis et quinquaginta acris marisci cum pertinenciis etc.

Et prior venit. Et frater Johannes de Norflete monachus est et Elyas de Munteny nichil habet per quod possit attachiatus. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eos per defaultam. Et prior dicit quod assisa non debet inde fieri quia dicit quod dominus rex aliquo tempore tradidit predictum redditum et mariscum predicto Johanni Mansell' dum Archiepiscopus Cantuar' fuit in partibus transmarinis. Ita quod post redditum predicti Archiepiscopi in Anglia dominus rex reddidit predictum redditum et mariscum predicto Archiepiscopo. Et predictus Archiepiscopus reddidit redditum et mariscum illum cuidam Johanni predecessori predicti prioris. Ita quod dominus rex precepit vicecomiti Kant' per breve suum quod predicto priori de predictis redditu et marisco plenarium seisinam habere faceret. Et quod ita sit ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod dominus rex aliquo tempore implaciavit predictum priorem de predictis marisco et redditu. Ita quod loquela illa esset sub iudicio et dominus rex

recuperasset saisinam suam per indeffensionem predicti prioris dominus rex tradidit predictum redditum et mariscum predicto Johanni Mannsell' qui inde fuit in seisina a festo Sancti Michealis usque ad Pascha proximo sequens dum Archiepiscopus Cant' fuit in partibus transmarinis. Ita quod postmodum predictus Archiepiscopus in reditu suo de partibus (transⁱ)marinis videns quod prioratus Dovere de pauperatus fuit per amissionem predictorum redditus et marisci et accessit ad dominum regem et tantum fecit quod Johannes Mansell' sponte sua reddidit predictum mariscum et redditum domino rege et dominus rex illum reddidit predicto Archiepiscopo et predictus Archiepiscopus illum reddidit predicto priori. Et quia predictus Johannes sponte sua reddidit domino regi predictos redditum et mariscum consideratum est quod predictus Johannes nichil capiat per assisam istam set sit in *miserericordia*²⁶ pro falso clamore.

B269.[Kent] (T) Did the prior of Saint Michael's of Dover, brother John of Northfleet and Ellis of Munteny disseise John Mansel, treasurer of York, of his free tenement in Wortle? He complains that the prior and the others disseised him of 6 marks rent and seventy acres of marsh.

The prior comes. Brother John of Northfleet is a monk and Ellis of Munteny has nothing by which he can be attached. So the assize is taken against them by default. The prior says that the assize ought not to be made, since he says that the king once handed the rent and marsh to John Mansel, while the archbishop of Canterbury was across the sea. Thus, after the archbishop returned to England the king rendered the rent and marsh to the archbishop. The archbishop rendered the rent and marsh to John, the prior's predecessor. Thus, the king, by writ, ordered the sheriff of Kent to make the prior have full seisin of the rent and marsh. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that the king once plead the prior concerning the marsh and rent. Thus, that suit was adjudged and the king recovered his seisin through a lack of a defense on the prior's part, the king [then] handed the rent and marsh to John Mansel. He was in full seisin from the feast of Saint Michael [29 September] until the following Easter, while the archbishop was across the sea. Thus, upon the archbishop's return from across the sea seeing the Priory of Dover was impoverished through the loss of the rent and marsh, he approached the king and persuaded him that John Mansel of his own accord should render the marsh and rent to the king. The king [then] rendered it to the archbishop and the archbishop to the prior. Since John Mansel freely rendered the rent and marsh to the king it is adjudged that John Mansel takes nothing by this assize, but is in *mercy* for false claim.

B270.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Maylardus de Emynd' pater Thome de Capella et Ricardi fratris eius fuit seysitus in dominico suo etc. de duabus acris terre et decem et septem denariis et duabus gallinis redditus cum pertinenciis in Easterst die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram et quem redditum Johannes Cabus tenet. Et Johannes non venit. Et fuit resommonitus. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eum per defaltam etc. Et super hoc venit Thomas de Schorne et dicit quod predictus Maylardus de cuius morte etc. feofavit quendam Radulfum Cabus patrem predicti Johannis de predicta terra. Et quod predictus Radulfus per feofamentum predicti Maylardi fuit in plena saisina de predicta terra per longum tempus ante mortem predicti Maylardi. Ita quod predictus Maylardus non obiit inde seysitus. Et profert quendam cartam sub nomine predicti Maylardi que testatur predictum feoffamentum etc.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Maylardus (de cuius morte etc.ⁱ) cum laborasset in extremis voluit feofare predictum Radulfum Cabus de predicta terra et fecit ei inde quendam cartam de feofamento quadam die circa horam primam et dicunt quod proxima nocte sequenti post confeccionem predictae carte predictus Maylardus obiit. Requesiti si predictus Radulfus Cabus aliquam haberet saisinam de predicta terra ante mortem predicti Maylardi, dicunt quod non. Set dicunt quod circiter per quindenam post mortem predicti Maylardi predictus Radulfus Cabus primo intravit in predictam terram unde dicunt quod predictus Maylardus de cuius morte etc. obiit seysitus de predicta terra in dominico suo ut de feodo. Et post terminum etc. Et quod predicti Thomas et Ricardus sunt heredes predicti Maylardi propinquiore. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Thomas et Ricardus recuperent

²⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

sasinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et predictus Johannes Cabus in *misericordia*.²⁷ Et predicta carta quam predictus Thomas de Schorne protulit sub nomine predicti Maylardi remanet in custodia H. le Bygod etc.

B270.[Kent] (T) Was Maylard of Ashenden father of Thomas of Capella and Richard his brother seized in demesne of two acres of land and a rent of seventeen pence and two hens in Easthurst on the day? John Cabus holds the land and rent. John has not come. He was resummoned. So the assize is taken against him by default. Concerning this Thomas of Shorne comes and says that Maylard enfeoffed Ralph Cabus, John's father, of the land. Ralph, through Maylard's enfeoffment, was in full seisin of the land for a long time before Maylard's death. Thus, Maylard did not die seized. He produced a charter under Maylard's name which testifies to that enfeoffment.

The jurors say that Maylard, as he was dying, sought to enfeoff Ralph Cabus of the land and he made a charter of enfeoffment on a certain day around the hour of prime. They say that the following night, after conferring the charter, Maylard died. Asked if Ralph Cabus had any seisin of the land before Maylard's death; they said no. But, they say that around the quindene after Maylard's death Ralph Cabus first entered the land. Wherefore, they say that Maylard died seized of the land in demesne as of fee and after the term [contained in the writ]. Thomas and Richard are Maylard's nearest heirs. So it is adjudged that Thomas and Richard recover their seisin. John Cabus [is] in *mercy*. The aforesaid charter which Thomas of Shorne produced under Maylard's name remains in [Hugh] Bigod's custody.

B271. Ass. ven. rec. si Radulfus de Godeburne pater Alicie filie Radulfi de Godeburne fuit seysitus in dominico suo etc. de duobus mesuagiis et sex daywerkes terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis in Sydingeburne die quo etc. Et si etc. Que mesuagia et terram Benedictus le Fevre de Sydingeburne tenet. Qui venit et per licenciam ei reddit ideo habeat sasinam suam etc.

B271.[Kent] Was Ralph of Goodbourne father of Alice daughter of Ralph of Goodbourne seized in demesne of two messuages and six and a half day-works of land in Sittingbourne on the day? Benedict le Ferrer of Siddingbourne holds the messuages and land. He comes and by licence he renders [the holdings] to her. So she shall have her seisin.

B272. Ass. ven. rec. si Ricardus le Rowe pater Willelmi le Roghwe fuit seysitus in dominico suo ut de feodo de una acra terra et dimidia cum pertinenciis in Estpecham die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Paganus le Moner tenet. Et Paganus non venit etc. Et fuit resummonitus ideo capiatur assisa versus eum per defaultam etc.

Juratores dicunt quod quidam Godefridus de Dene feofavit predictum Ricardum le Rughwe de cuius morte etc. de predicta terra. Et quod predictus Ricardus obiit seysitus in dominico ut de feodo et post terminum etc. Et quod predictus Willelmus est heres eius propinquior. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Ricardus recuperet sasinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Paganus in *misericordia*.²⁸

B272.[Kent] Was Richard le Rowe father of William le Rowe seized in demesne of one and a half acres of land in East Peckham on the day? Pagan le Miller holds the land. Pagan has not come. He was resummoned. So the assize is taken against him by default.

The jurors say that Godfrey of Dean enfeoffed Richrad le Rowe of the land. Richard died seized as of fee and after the term [contained in the writ]. William is his nearest heir. So it is adjudged that [William] recovers his seisin. Pagan [is] in *mercy*.

B273.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Petrus de Hauckeswell' pater Saffridi filii Petri fuit seysitus in dominico etc. de uno molendino et quatuor solidis redditus cum pertinenciis in Seyveton' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quod molendinum et quem redditum Johannes Edws de Hethe tenet. Qui venit et bene cognovit quod predictus Petrus de cuius morte etc. obiit seysitus de predictis

²⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

molendino et redditu ut de feodo. Et post terminum in brevi contentum et quod predictus Saffridus est heres eius propinquior, set dicit quod predictus Saffridus qui tulit assisam istam post mortem predicti Petri patris sui feofavit ipsum de predictis molendino et redditu per quandam cartam quam profert et que hoc testatur. Et super hoc venit Fulco Payforer vicecomes Kant' et dicit quod predictus Saffridus ydeota est. Et quod predictus Johannes Edwys falso fecit fieri predictam cartam dum predictus Saffridus fuit in custodia ipsius Johannis. Et quia predictus Saffridus visus est in curia et inventus ydeota, ideo inquiretur rei veritas de predicto feofamento et de statu predicti Saffridi per vicecomitem Kant' et per omnes milites de comitatu. Qui omnes dicunt quod predictus Saffridus ydeota est a natione sua. Et quod predicta carta facta fuit dum predictus Saffridus fuit in custodia predicti Johannis de commissione cuiusdam Alicie quondam uxoris predicti Petri patris predicti Saffridi et sororis predicti Johannis Edwys. Ita quod in seisina quam habuit per custodiam predictam cepit saisinam de feofamento suo. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Saffridus recuperet saisinam suam. Et quod predicta carta dampnetur. Et predictus Johannes pro transgressionem committatur *gaole*.²⁹ Et predictus Saffridus committatur simul cum terra sua in custodia Johannis de Sandwy' ad inveniendum ei rationabilem sustentacionem de terra sua et ad respondendum de residuo cum necesse fuerit etc. Post venit predictus Johannes Edwy et finem fecit per *xl solidos*³⁰ per plegium Rogeri de Northwode et Stephani rectoris Ecclesie de Hethe.

B273.[Kent] (T) Was Peter of Hawkswell father of Saffrid son of Peter seized in demesne of one mill and four shillings rent in Sevington on the day? John Edwy of Heath holds the mill and rent. He comes and readily acknowledges that Peter died seized of the mill and rent as of fee and after the term contained in the writ and that Saffrid is his nearest heir. But, he says that Saffrid, who brought this assize after Peter's death, enfeoffed him of the mill and rent by a certain charter, which he produced and in which this is testified. Concerning the above, Fulk Payforer, sheriff of Kent, comes and says that Saffrid is an idiot. [He says] that John Edwy falsely caused the charter to be made while Saffrid was in John's custody. Since Saffrid is seen in court and is found to be an idiot, so the truth of the matter concerning the enfeoffment and Saffrid's state is to be inquired into by the sheriff of Kent and by all the knights of the county. They all say that Saffrid was an idiot from birth and that the charter was made while Saffrid was in John's custody, at Alice's commision, one time Peter's wife and John's sister. Thus through the seisin which he had by the custody he took seisin of his enfeoffment. So it is adjudged that Saffrid recovers his seisin. The aforesaid charter is cancelled. John is to be committed to *gaol* for the transgression. Saffrid along with his land is to be committed to John of Sandwich's custody to find reasonable sustenance for him from his land and to answer for the remainder when necessary. Afterwards, John Edwy came and made fine for 40 *shillings* by pledge of Roger of Northwood and Stephen the rector of the church of Heath.

B274. Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes de Masegref pater Gunnilde uxori Hamonis filii Wydoni et Dyonisie et Matilde sororum ipsius Gunnilde fuit seyistus in dominico suo etc. de quatuor acris terre cum pertinenciis in Watstapl' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram Ricardus de Mereyden' tenet. Qui venit et dicit quod non debet predictis-----Gunnilde et Dyonisie inde respondere sine predictis Hamone et Matilde participibus ipsorum ideo summoneantur predicti Hamo et Matilda quod sint in proximo adventu H. le Bygot ad sequendum simul cum predictis Gunnilde et Dyonisie si voluerint etc. Idem dies datus est predictis Gunnilde et Dyonisie et similiter predicto Ricardo in banco etc. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat recognitores illius assise ad eundem terminum. Et breve interim remanet penes vicecomitem etc.

B274.[Kent] Was John of Masegref father of Gunhild wife of Hamo son of Guy and Denise and Matilda her sisters seized in demesne of four acres of land in Whitstaple on the day? Richard of Merton holds the land. He comes and says that ----- Gunhild and Denise ought not to answer without Hamo and Matilda their partciapnts. So Hamo and Matilda are

²⁹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

³⁰Margin note by scribe, xl. s. crossed out.

to be summoned to be in the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod to sue along with Gunhild and Denise if the wish. The same day is given Gunhild and Denise and likewise Richard at the bench. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of the assize come at the same term. In the meantime, the writ remains with the sheriff.

B275. Ass. ven. rec. si Radulfus Attetune' avunculus Hamonis de Rething' fuit seysitus in dominico etc. de quadraginta acris terre [et] viginti solidis redditus et redditu viginti et quinque gallinarum cum pertinenciis in Wodechirch' et Roking' die quo etc. Et si etc. Quam terram et quem redditum Johannes de Cryol' tenet. Qui venit. Et concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis quod predictus Johannes recognovit predictam terram et redditum cum pertinenciis esse jus ipsius Hamonis et illos ei reddidit etc. Et pro hac etc. Idem Hamo dedit ei unum spervarium sorum etc.

B275.[Kent] Was Ralph Attertune uncle of Hamo of Rooting seized in demesne of forty acres of land, 20 shillings rent and a rent of twenty-five hens in Woodchurch and Rooting on the day? John of Crioil holds the land and rent. He comes and the are agreed by licence. The agreement is as such that John recognizes the land and rent to be Hamo's right and he rendered it to him. For this, Hamo gave him one unmewed sparrowhawk.

B276.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Edmundus de la Brome pater Dyonisie filie Edmundi de la Brome fuit seysitus in dominico suo etc. de octo acris terre cum pertinenciis in Nortburne die quo. Et si etc. Quam terram Gilbertus de Bradewater tenet. Qui venit et dicit quod predicta Dyonisie non potest esse heres predicti Edmundi quia dicit predictus Edmundus commisit feloniam suspendendi se ipsum unde dicit quod secundum consuetudinem Kant' forisfecit tenementum suum. Et Dyonisia hoc idem cognoscit set, dicit quod predictus Edmundus secundum legem et consuetudinem Kant' non forisfecit tenementum suum. Et quia leges et consuetudines Kant' diversificantur a consuetudinibus et legibus aliorum comitatorum, ideo inquiratur per vicecomitem et milites comitatus Kant' que sit consuetudino Kant' in tali casu et est dissencio inde inter milites comitatus.

Post venit predictus Gilbertus et vocat inde ad warantum Gilbertum Calabre habeat eum in proximo adventu H. le Bygot ad partes istas. Et breve interim remanet penes vicecomitem. Post venit predictus Gilbertus et warrantizat predicto Gilberto et vocat inde ad warantum Abbatem Sancti Augustini Cantuar' habeat in proximo adventu etc. per auxilium curiam.

B276.[Kent] (T) Was Edmund de la Broom father of Denise daughter of Edmund de la Broom seized in demesne of eight acres of land in Northbourne on the day? Gilbert of Broadwater holds the land. He comes and says that Denise cannot be Edmund's heir, since Edmund committed the felony of hanging himself. Wherefore, according to the custom of Kent he forfeits his tenement. Denise acknowledges this, but she says that Edmund does not forfeit his tenement according to the law and custom of Kent, since the laws and customs of Kent differ from the laws and customs of other counties. What the custom is in such a case is to be inquired into by the sheriff and knights of the county of Kent. Thereafter there is a disagreement among the knights of the county.

Afterwards, Gilbert comes and calls to warrant Gilbert Calabre. He shall have him in the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod to these parts. In the meantime the writ remains with the sheriff. Afterwards, Gilbert came and warranted Gilbert and called the abbot of Saint Augustine's Canterbury to warrant. He shall have him in the next coming [of Hugh Bigod to these parts] by aid of the court.

[Membrane 15]

Adhuc de Assisis et Juratis

Still Concerning Assizes and Jury-Pleas

B277. Ass. ven. rec. si Laurencius de Eche, Alexanderus et Nicholaus fratres eius injuste etc. disseisiverunt Beatritam la Fraunceyes' de libero tenemento suo in Thylyndene post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod predicti Laurencius et alii disseisiverunt eam de uno mesuagio et

tribus acris terre et dimidia cum pertinenciis etc.

Et Laurencius et alii veniunt et dicunt quod predicta Beatrita nunquam fuit inde in seysina. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et de hoc ponunt se super assisam ideo capiatur assisa.

Juratores dicunt quod quidam Humfridus pater predictorum Laurencii, Alexanderi, Nicholai et cuiusdam Ade patris predictae Beatrite que tulit assisam istam tenuit predictam terram simul cum aliis terris in gavelikende. Ita quod predictus Adam filius predicti Humfridi antenatus ivit in partes ultramarinis et ibi desponsavit quandam uxorem de qua procreavit predictam (Dyonisiam^s). Et postea cum predicta (Dyonisia^s) intellexisset quod predictus Humfridus obisset et Adam pater suus similiter mortuus esset, predicta (Dyonisia^s) venit in Anglia et adivit Johannem filium Bernardi capitalem dominum illius feodi et petiit quod justiciam ei exhiberet de rationabile parte sua que eam contingebat de hereditate predicti Humfridi per predictum Adam patrem suum filium predicti Humfridi. Et quia non constabat predicto Johanni filii Bernardi capitali domino quod ipsa esset filia predicti Ade. Ita quod aliquid ei facere vellet de rationabili parte sua ipsa processu temporis revertebatur in partes ubi nata fuit et ubi mater sua desponsata fuit predicto Ade patri suo et adivit episcopum loci et perquisivit litteras ipsius episcopi testimoniales quod filia erat predicti Ade et de legitimo matrimonio que cum processu temporis venisset cum litteras predicti episcopi ad predictum Johannem filium Bernardi capitalem dominum feodi illius, predictus Johannes per considerationem curie sue reddidit ei saisinam predictae partis sue. Et cum servientes predicti Johannis venissent cum ipsa ad ponendum ipsam in saysina, predicti Laurencius, Alexanderus et Nicholaus vi resisterunt eis et non permiserunt quod aliquam saisina capere posset. Ita quod predicta (Dyonisia^s) nomine saisine intravit in quandam portariam et in ea se tenuit per unum diem et unam noctem quousque predicti Laurencius et alii ipsam inde eiecerunt (e)

Postea convenit inter eos quod predicta Beatrita recognovit predicta tenementa esse jus predicti Alexanderi qui modo ea tenet et illa excepta una acra terre remisit de se et heredibus suis predicto Alexandero et heredibus etc. imperpetuum. Et pro hac etc. predictus Alexanderus concessit eidem Beatrite unum mesuagium cum pertinenciis in eadem villa et unam acram terre de eadem terra, scilicet illud mesuagium quod est juxta mesuagio et illam acre terre que est in loco illo qui vocatur Twantyne tenenda etc. de capitale dominis feodi illius per servicium que ad mesuagium illud et terram pertinent. Et preterea predictus Alexanderus dat eidem Beatrite ^vque marcas argenti de quibus ei reddet medietatem ad Pascha anno xliii et aliam medietatem ad festum Sancti Michaelis proximo sequens. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat etc.

B277.[Kent] Did Laurence of Eche, Alexander and Nicholas his brothers disseise Beatrice le Franceys of her free tenement in Tilden? She complains that Laurence and the others have disseised her of one message and three and a half acres of land.

Laurence and the others come and say that Beatrice was never in seisin so that she could be disseised. On this they place themselves on the assize. So the assize is taken.

The jurors say that Humfrey, father of Laurence, Alexander, Nicholas and Adam, Beatrice's father, held the land along with other lands in gavelkind. Thus, Adam son of Humfrey, the eldest [son], was born in parts across the sea and there he married his wife from whom he begat [Beatrice]. Afterwards, when [Beatrice] learned that Humfrey had died and likewise [since] her father was dead, she came to England and approached John son of Bernard chief lord of that fee and sought that he show her justice concerning her reasonable share which befell her from Humfrey's inheritance. Since it was not clear to John son of Bernard that she was Adam's daughter, so that he should [give] her a reasonable part, she in the course of time returned to the place of her birth and where her mother was married to Adam. [There] she approached the local bishop and obtained testimonial letters from the bishop [stating] that she was Adam's daughter and from a legitimate marriage. When in the course of time she returned to John son of Bernard with the bishop's letters, John by consideration of his court rendered her seisin of her parts. When John's serjeants came with [Beatrice] to place her in seisin Laurence, Alexander and Nicholas forcefully resisted them and did not allow any seisin to be taken. Thus, [Beatrice] in the name of seisin entered into a gatehouse and held herself in it for a day and a night, until Laurence and the others ejected

her.

Afterwards, it [is] agreed between them that Beatrice recognize the tenements to be Alexander's right, as [he] now holds them and that except for one acre she remits for herself and her heirs to Alexander and his heirs [all right and claim] in perpetuity. For this, Alexander grants Beatrice one messuage in the vill and one acre of land from the same land, namely the messuage which is next to the messuage and the acre which is in a place called 'Twantyne' to hold of the chief lords of that fee by the service which pertains to the messuage and land. Moreover, Alexander gives Beatrice five silver marks of which he shall render her half at Easter year 43 [13 April 1259] and the other half at the following feast of Saint Michael [September 29]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy his lands.

B278.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Bonefacius Cantuar' Archiepiscopus (et Galfridus de Saxlingherstⁱ) injuste etc. disseisiverunt Augustinum de Iden' et Radulfum frater eius, Elyam de Idenn', Walterum filium Thome, Willelmum de Idenn' et Osbertum de Idenn' de libero tenemento suo in Idenn' post primam etc. Et unde queruntur quod disseisiverunt eos de centum acris bosci cum pertinenciis, exceptis quercubus et fagis qui ad predictum Archiepiscopum pertinent ratione pesonearum de arborum. Et Archiepiscopus non venit sed predictus Galfridus ballivus eius venit et respondet pro eo. Et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum quod dicit quod predictus boscus in quo ipsi queruntur se disseisiri est proprium solum predicti Archiepiscopi domini sui et in quo predicti Augustinus et alii nunquam aliquid habuerunt nisi solummodo communam pasture et hoc ex gracia vel permissione predicti Archiepiscopi et predecessorum suorum vel pro suo dando. (Dicit etiam quod predictus Archiepiscopus nichil inde scivit.ⁱ) Et de hoc ponit se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus boscus de quo predicti Augustus et alii queruntur [se] disseisiri est solum ipsorum et non solum predicti Archiepiscopi et quod ipsi et antecessores sui semper solebant percipere in eodem subbuscum per totum et omnimoda -----minuta ligna exceptis quercubus et magnis fagis quas predictus Archiepiscopus et predecessores sui percipere (consueveruntⁱ) in eodem pro voluntate sua, ita cum quod predicti homines et antecessores sui semper consueverunt et usi fuerunt eradicare succos earumdem quercuum et fagorum postquam prostrate fuerunt et illos asportare pro voluntate sua sine contradicione predictorum Archiepiscoporum vel ballivorum (suorum.ⁱ) Et similiter habere solebant in eodem bosco omnimoda averia sua pascencia per totum annum postquam in mense defenso scilicet tempore fenacionis et quousque quidam ballivus istius Archiepiscopi cepit ab eis denarios pro porcis suis habendis in predicto bosco tempore pesone scilicet ab aliquo ipsorum duos solidos et ab aliquo tres solidos quousque predictus Galfridus ipsos omnino tenuit extra predictum boscum unde dicunt precise quod idem Galfridus disseisivit predictos Augustinum et alios de predicto bosco quem posuerunt in visu suo injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ipsi quesiti si predicta disseisina eis facta fuit ex precepto predicti Archiepiscopi vel si predicti Augustinus et alii unquam ostendissent eidem Archiepiscopo quod ipse illud eis emendari faceret, dicunt quod non. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Augustinus et alii recuperent seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Galfridus in (in^r) *misericordia*.³¹ Et Augustinus et alii similiter in *misericordia*³² pro falso clamore versus predictum Archiepiscopum.

B278.(Kent) Did Boniface the Archbishop of Canterbury and Geoffrey of Saxlinghurst disseise Augustine of Iden, Ralph his brother, Ellis of Iden, Walter son of Thomas, William of Iden and Osbert of Iden of their free tenement in Iden? They complain that they have disseised them of one hundred acres of woods, excepting the oaks and beeches which belong to the archbishop by reason of mast from the trees. The archbishop has not come, but Geoffrey his bailiff comes and answers for him. He says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says the wood about which they complain they have been disseised is the archbishop's own site and in which Augustine and the others never had anything, except common pasture and this only at the archbishop's grace or permission and that of his predecessors. He also says that the archbishop knows nothing [of this matter]. On this he places himself on the assize.

The jurors say that the wood about which Augustine and the others complain they have

³¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³²Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

been disseised is their site and not the archbishop's site. They and all their ancestors were always accustomed to collect throughout the underwood all kinds of-----small wood, except the oaks and great beeches which the archbishop and his predecessors were accustomed to collect at their will. Even then the men and their ancestors were always accustomed to draw the sap from the oaks and beeches which were knocked down and to carry them off at their own will without any contradiction from the archbishops or their bailiffs. Likewise, they were accustomed to have pasture throughout the year for all the beasts after the enclosure, namely in the springtime, until the archbishop's bailiff took money from them to have their pigs in the woods during the autumn, namely from some of them [he took] two shillings and from others three shillings, until Geoffrey completely deprived them of the wood. Wherefore, they say that Geoffrey disseised Augustine and the others of the wood. The [jurors] were asked if this disseisin was done on the archbishop's order or if Augustine and the others ever showed the archbishop that he needed to make amends; they said no. So it is adjudged that Augustine and the others recover their seisin. Geoffrey [is] in *mercy*. Augustine and the others are likewise in *mercy* for false claim against the archbishop.

B279.(Kant') Davidus filius Bricii de Werting' qui tulit assisam mortis antecessoris versus Reginaldum de Westbrook' de duabus acris terre cum pertinenciis in Werting' venit et retraxit se. Ideo (ipse et plegii^{ul}) predictus Reginaldus inde sine die. Et Davidus et plegii sui de proseguendo in *miser cordia*,³³ scilicet Jacobus de Hope et Eustchius de Hamsted', perdonatur per justiciarium.

B279.(Kent) David son of Brice of Werting, who brought an assize of mort d' ancestor against Reginald of Westbrook concerning two acres of land in Werting, comes and withdraws his suit. So Reginald is without a day. David and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely James of Hope and Eustace of Hampstead. He is pardoned by the justiciar.

B280.(Kant', T) Ass. ven. rec. si Thomas Burgeys et Johannes de la Rede injuste etc. disseisiverunt Andream de Oxerod' et Johannam uxorem eius de libero tenemento suo in Elham. Et unde queruntur quod disseisiverunt eum de uno messuagio, circiter 1^a acris terre, viginti acris pasture, decem et novem solidatis redditus et de redditu xxv gallinarum per annum cum pertinenciis. Et Thomas venit et nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit quod quidam Nicholaus de Wygeberg' "tenuit" aliquo tempore predicta tenementa de domino Edwardo filio domini regis primogenito domino suo (etⁱ) vendidit eadem tenementa predictis Andree et Johanne et dicit quod quia ipsi intraverunt eadem tenementa que fuerunt de feodo predicti Edwardi sine licencia sua, ipse tanquam ballivus ipsius Edwardi et ad mandatum domini sui non permisit ipsos uti seisinam sua. Et dicit quod ipse nichil clamat in eisdem tenementis neque feodo neque liberum tenementum. Et quod nullam aliam disseisinam eis inde fecit ponit se super assisam. Et Johannes non venit nec fuit attachiatus quia non fuit inventus. Ideo capiatur assisa versus eum per defaltam. Et Willelmus de Crioll' et Henricus de Berham juratores non venerunt ideo in *miser cordia*.³⁴

Juratores dicunt quidam Nicholaus de Wygheberg' qui tenuit predicta tenementa in feodo feoffavit inde predictos Andream et Johannam iam dimidio anno elapso per cartam suam et ipsos in plenariam seisinam posuit per feoffamentum predictum et in eadem seisinam pacifice steterunt usque ad diem Lune proximo preteritam scilicet proximam ante Purificacionem Beate Marie quando predicti Thomas et Johannes ipsos inde eiecerunt, unde dicunt precise quod predicti Thomas et Johannes disseisiverunt predictos Andream et Johannam de predictis tenementis injuste etc. Et ipsi quesiti si predicti Thomas et Johannes apropiaverunt eis predicta tenementa vel ad opus Edwardi filii domini regis dicunt quod ad opus predicti Edwardi dominum sui. Dies datus est eis de *audiendo judicio* suo in octabis Purificaonis Beate Marie apud Westmonasterium. Postea ad diem illum quia predicti Andrea et Johanna non possunt dedicere quin predictus Edwardus filius domini regis sit in seisinam de predictis tenementis qui (nonⁱ) nominatur in brevi consideratum est quod predicti Andreas et Johanna nichil capinat per breve istud. Et perquiserent sibi per aliud breve si voluerunt. Et Thomas

³³Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

³⁴Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

nichilominus in *misericordia*³⁵ pro transgressione. (*Dampna siquando xx solidi* ^e).

B280.(Kent, T) Did Thomas Burgess and John de la Rede disseise Andrew of Oxroad and John his wife of their free tenement in Elham? They complain that they have disseised them of one messuage, about 50 acres of land, twenty acres of pasture, nineteen shillings rent and a rent of 25 hens. Thomas comes and says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says Nicholas of Wikeberg once held the tenements from the lord Edward, the king's first son and his lord. [He also says that] Nicholas sold the tenements to Andrew and Joan [and] since they entered the tenements which were Edward's fee without his licence, he, as Edward's bailiff and at his lord's command, did not allow them their seisin. He says that he claims nothing in the tenements neither as a fee nor as a free tenement. That he made no disseisin to them on this he places himself on the assize. John has not come nor was he attached since he was not found. So the assize is taken against him by default. William of Crioil and Henry of Barham jurors have not come so they [are] in *mercy*.

The jurors say that a half year ago Nicholas of Wikeberg, who held the tenements in fee, enfeoffed Andrew and Joan by his charter. He placed them in full seisin by that enfeoffment. They stood in paeceful seisin until the following Monday, namely the first [Monday] before the Purification of the Blessed Mary, when Thomas and John ejected them. Wherefore, they say exactly this, that Thomas and John disseised Andrew and Joan of the tenements. The [jurors] were asked if Thomas and John appropriated the tenements to themselves or to the benefit of the lord Edward; they said to the lord Edward's benefit. A day is given them for their *judicial hearing* in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] at Westminster. Afterwards, on that day since Andrew and Joan were not able to deny the fact that Edward is in seisin of the tenements and was not named in the writ, so it is adjudged that Andrew and Joan take nothing by this assize. Let them persue by another writ if they wish. Thomas, nonetheless, [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

B281.(Kant', T) Ass. ven. rec. si Simo de Wykham, Marta que fuit uxor Salomoni de Dovr' et Walterus de Bersted' injuste etc. disseisverunt Salomonum filium Salomoni de libero tenemento suo in Wyckham post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de xxii acris terre et vi acris bosci cum pertinenciis. Et Walterus et Marta veniunt. Et Walterus nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat, nisi tantum (quod dicit¹) quod predictus Sa(lo¹)manum alias coram Gilberto de Preston' et sociis suis justiciariis ultimo itinerantibus in comitatu isto recuperavit seisinam suam de predictis tenementis versus predictum Simonem de Wykham per assisam mortis antecessoris inde inter eos captam. Ita quod idem Simo postea arrainiavit quendam juratam xxiiii^{OR} ad convicendum xii (juratores¹) predictae assise coram Nicholao de Turri justiciario ad hoc assignato apud Grenewiz'. Ita quod predicta Marta mater ipsius Salomoni et custos eius eo quod est infra etatem per finem xx marcarum quas predicti xii illius assise dederunt predictae Marte, reddidit ipsa predicta tenementa eisdem xii et ipsos in plenariam seisinam posuit. Qui postea feoffaverunt inde predictum Simonem et idem Simo ipsum Walterum. Et de hoc ponit se super recordum rotulorum predicti Nicholai. Et concedit quod nisi hoc convictatur per recordum predictorum rotulorum quod predictus Salomanus recuperet seisinam suam versus eum. Et Marta dicit quod revera predictus Simo arrainiavit predictam juratam xxiiii^{OR} de predictis tenementis coram predicto Nichalao apud Grenewiz', sed dicit quod ipsa nunquam reddidit eidem Simoni predicta tenementa. Dicit enim quod revera ipsa concessit ibidem extra curiam quod permetteret ipsum Simonem habere seisinam de eisdem tenementis per predictum finem xx marcarum que predicti xii fecerunt cum ea, et quod predicti Simo et Walterus propria auctoritate sua posuerunt se in seisinam de eisdem (tenementis¹) absque aliqua reddicione quam ipsa unquam fecisset in curia domini regis vel alibi. Et de hoc ponit se super recordum rotulorum predicti Nicholai. Ideo datus est eis dies in octabis Purificacionis Beate Marie apud *Westmonasterium*. Et interim querantur rotuli. Et Simo non venit nec fuit attachiatus ob temporis brevitatem. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod attachiet eum quod sit ad eundem terminum. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem. Et Radulfus Haket et Johannes Terri vir ipsius Marthe manuceperunt habendi predictam Martham ad predictum diem. Et concessum est quod Johannes de Rames' sequitur pro

³⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

predicto Salomane qui est infra etatem. Postea quesiti sunt rotuli predicti Nicholai in quibus compertum est quod predictus Simo tulit quandam juratam xxiiii^{or} ad convicendum xii^{cim} versus predictum Salomanem de predictis tenementis et quod idem Simo coram predicto Nicholao postea retraxit se occasione cuius retraxcionis convenit inter eos quod predicta Martha custos predicti Salomani reddidit predicta tenementa predicto Simoni. Et quia per recordum istud convictum est quod predicta Martha que tantummodo habuit custodiam predicti tenementi ratione predicti Salomani illud in fraudem reddidit predicto Simoni quod facere nullatenus potuit nec debuit consideratum est quod predicta convencio nulla concordia nullam sit quo ad predictam reddicionem, set revocatur in irritum. Et quod predictus Salomanus rehatet seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Martha et Simo in *misericordia*.³⁶ Et Martha committatur *gaole*.³⁷ Et forisfecit predictam custodiam.

Postea de consilio curie committatur predicta custodia cuidam Johanni Munyn fratri predictae Martha antenato et avunculo ipsius Salomani ad opus eiusdem usque ad legitimam etatem suam. Et ad hoc invenit hos plegios scilicet Thomam Chych' et Galfridum le Sauvage ad respondendum eidem Salomani de proficio et exitibus eorumdem tenementorum cum ad etatem suam pervenierit secundum consuetudinem Kant' etc. Et inquiratur de dampnis in adventu H. le Bygod etc. Et misericordia predictae Marthe remittitur ad instanciam comitis Glouc'.

B281.(Kent, T) Did Simon of Wickham, Martha who was the wife of Soloman of Dover and Walter of Bearsted disseise Soloman son of Soloman of his free tenement in Wickham? He complains that they have disseised him of 22 acres of land and 6 acres of woods. Walter and Martha come. Walter says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he says that Soloman, elsewhere, by an assize of mort d' ancestor taken between them before Gilbert de Preston and his colleagues justices last intinerant in this county recovered his seisin of the tenements against Simon of Wickham. Thus, Simon afterwards arraigned a jury of 24 to attain the 12 jurors of the aforesaid assize before Nicholas de Tower, justice assigned to this case at Greenwich. Thus, Martha Soloman's mother and his guardian, because Soloman is under age, for a fine of 20 marks which the aforesaid 12 [jurors] of that assize gave her she [in turn] rendered the tenements to the 12 [jurors] and placed them in full seisin. Afterwards they enfeoffed Simon and Simon [enfeoffed] Walter. On this he places himself on the record of Nicholas' rolls. He grants that unless this is found to be so by the record of the rolls then Soloman shall recover his seisin against him. Martha says that Simon arraigned the jury of 24 before Nicholas at Greenwich, but she says that she never rendered the tenements to Simon. She also says that there outside the court she granted that she would allow Simon to have seisin of the tenements in return for the fine of 20 marks which the 12 [jurors] made with her. [She says] that Simon and Walter on their own authority placed themselves in seisin of the tenements without her ever having made any grant in the king's court or elsewhere. On this she places herself on the record of Nicholas' rolls. So a day is given them in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] at *Westminster*. In the meantime the rolls are to be examined. Simon has not come nor was he attached on account of the brevity of time. So the sheriff is ordered to attach him to be here at the same term. The writ remains with the sheriff. Ralph Haket and John Terri, Martha's husband, undertake to have Matha on that day. It is granted that John of Ramsey is to sue for Soloman, who is under age. Afterwards, Nicholas' rolls were examined in which it is determined that Simon brought a jury of 24 to attain the 12 against Soloman and that Simon withdrew himself before Nicholas. On the occasion of the withdrawal there was an agreement between them, [namely] that Martha, Solomon's guardian, rendered the tenements to Simon. Since it is found by that record that Martha, who only holds the custody of the tenements by reason of Soloman, fraudulently rendered [them] to Simom [and] she is by no means able nor ought she [to render them], so it is adjudged that the agreement is no concord and is null and void. It is revoked in anger. Soloman shall regain his seisin by view. Martha and Simon [are] in *mercy*. Martha is to be committed to *gaol*. She forfeits the custody.

Afterwards, by the counsel of the court the custody is to be committed to John Monk,

³⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³⁷Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

Martha's younger brother and Soloman's uncle, for [Soloman's] benefit until his legitimate age. For this, John found these pledges, namely Thomas Chich and Geoffrey le Sauvage [who are] to answer to Soloman concerning the profits and outgoings of the tenements when he comes of age according to the customs of Kent. The damages are to be looked into in the [next] coming of [Hugh] Bigod. Martha's amercement is remitted at the instance of the earl of Gloucester.

Humfrid' Ad' Bernard³⁸
Humfrey, Adam, Bernard

[Membrane 15d.]

B282.(Kant', T, cs.) Ass. ven. rec. si Johannes filius Bernardi injuste etc. disseisivit Simonem de Echingham de libero tenemento suo in Stane post primam etc. Et unde quidam Willelmus Peyforer (custos predicti Simoniⁱ) dicit quod Simo de Echingham pater predicti Simoni dudum feoffavit ipsum Simonem filium suum de una carucata terre cum pertinentiis qui terram illam tradidit custodiendam ipsi Willelmo simul cum predicto Simone eo quod idem Simo fuit infra etatem et dicit quod ipse per magnum tempus fuit in seisin de eisdem tenementis per tradicionem illam quousque predictus Johannes ipsum (vi et armisⁱ) inde eiecit et postmodum in processu temporis rapuit ei predictum Simonem, unde queritur pro predicto Simone quod predictus Johannes eum disseisivit injuste etc. Et dicit quod quia predictus Johannes rapuit ei predictum Simonem non potuit ipse habere eum hic ad prosequendum breve suum. Et Johannes non venit. Et fuit attachiatus per Willelmum atte Hoke et Maynardum de Boxherst ideo ipsi in misericordia. Et quia predictus Willelmus queritur quod predictus Johannes rapuit ei predictum Simonem preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringit (predictam^{ul}) predictum Johannem per omnes terras etc. Ita quod habeat corpus eius in octabis Purificacionis Beate Marie apud *Westmonasterium* ad respondendum eidem Willelmo de predicto transgressione. Et quod habeat ibi predictum Simonem. Postea ad diem illum apud Westmonasterium veniunt predicti Johannes et Simo. Et predictus Johannes bene defendit quod nunquam vi et armis eiecit predictum Simonem de predicta tenementa nec predictum Willelmum custodiam suam nec predictum Simonem subtraxit a custodia sua, quia dicit quod idem Simo gratis se posuit in custodia sua. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam. Et Willelmus similiter ideo fiat inde jurata. Et reddidit eidem Willelmo predictum Simonem. Et quo ad assisam nichil dicit quare illa remaneat nisi tantum dicit quod nullam disseisinam inde fecit. Et de hoc ponit se super assisam. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat coram H. le Bygod in proximo adventu etc. tot et tales etc. per quos tam predicta jurata quam assisa illa capi possit etc.

B282.(Kent, T, morrow) Did John son of Bernard disseise Simon of Etchingham of his free tenement in Stone? William Payforer, Simon's guardian, says that Simon of Etchingham, Simon's father, enfeoffed Simon, his son, of one carucate of land which he handed over to William's custody along with Simon, because Simon was under age. He says that he was in seisin of the tenement for a long time through that act, until John with force of arms ejected him and during the course of time seized Simon from him. Wherefore, he complains on Simon's behalf that John unjustly disseised him. He says that since John seized Simon he is not able to have him here to sue his writ. John has not come. He was attached by William atte Hook and Maynard of Boxhurst, so he [is] in mercy. Since William complains that John seized Simon from him the sheriff is ordered to distrain John throughout all his land, so that he may have his body in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] at *Westminster* to answer to William. And he shall have Simon there. Afterwards, on that day at Westminster John and Simon came. John readily maintains that he never ejected Simon with force of arms from the tenement nor did he seize Simon from William's custody. Since he says that Simon freely placed himself in his custody. On this he places himself on the assize. William [does] likewise, so let there be a jury trial thereon. He rendered Simon to William. As regards the assize he says nothing to stop the assize, except only that he made

³⁸The following is at the foot of the membrane without an entry mark thus, *ff*.

no disseisin. On this he places himself on the assize. So the sheriff is ordered that he make come before [Hugh] Bigod in his next coming [to these parts] all and everything by which the jury as well as the assize can be taken.

B283. Hamo de Crevequoer in *misericordia*³⁹ pro contemptu curie.

B283. Hamo of Crevequer [is] in *mercy* for contempt of court.

B284.(Kant',T) Ass. ven. rec. si Hugo de la Mare et Johanna uxor eius injuste etc. disseisiverunt Eustachium filium Hugoni a la Brome, Odonem, Thomam et Gilbertum fratres eius de libero tenemento suo in Berham post primam etc. Et unde queruntur quod disseisiverunt eos de uno mesuagio, xl acris terre, et una marcata redditus cum pertinenciis. Et Hugo et Johanna veniunt et dicunt quod assisa non debet inde fieri quia dicit quod predictus Hugo a la Brome pater ipsorum Eustachii et aliorum quondam vir ipsius Johanne feoffavit ipsam de predictis tenementis antequam eam desponsasset, tenenedam tota vita ipsius Johanne et ipsam inde in plenariam seisinam posuit ante celebracionem matrimonii factam inter eos. Et profert cartam ipsius Hugoni que hoc testatur.

Et Eustachius et alii dicunt quod quaecumque cartam ipsa (proferant^s) sub nomine predicti Hugoni patris ipsorum ipse cum Johanna nunquam aliquam seisinam haberunt de predictis tenementis ante celebracionem matrimonii factam inter eos nec idem Hugo unquam statum suum mutavit, immo inde obiit seisitus. Ita quod ipsi post mortem predicti Hugoni patris ipsorum successerunt ei in predictis tenementis tamquam fillii eius et heredes et fuerunt in seisina de eisdem tenementis (tenementis^t) tamquam in custodia ipsius Johanne quousque predictus Hugo de la Mare ipsam Johannam desponsavit et iidem Hugo et Johanna ipsos omnino de predictis tenementis eiecerunt. Et de hoc petunt assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera predictus Hugo a la Brome pater predictorum Eustachii et aliorum quondam vir predictae Johanne die quo eam desponsavit confecit eidem Johanne quandam cartam de feoffamento de predictis tenementis et eodem die in contineti eam desponsavit absque aliqua seisina quam eadem Johanna inde habuit ante celebracionem matrimonii inter eos factam. Et dicunt quod predicti Eustachius, Odo, et alii post mortem predicti Hugoni patris ipsorum fuerunt in seisina de eisdem tenementis ut in custodia predictae Johanne matris ipsorum donec predictus Hugo (a la Brome^s) ipsam Johannam desponsavit et ipsos penitus tenuerunt extra tenementa predicta iam (sex annis elapsis^l) unde dicunt quod predicti Hugo et Johanna disseisiverunt predictos Eustachium, Odonem, et alios de predictis mesuagio, terra et redditu que ipsi ponuerunt in visu suo injuste etc. sicut breve dicit. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Eustachius et alii recuperent seisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et Hugo in *misericordia*.⁴⁰ *Dampna. xv marce, cxx solidi.*

B284.(Kent, T) Did Hugh de la Mare and Joan his wife disseise Eustace son of Hugh a la Broome, Odo, Thomas and Gilbert his brothers from their free tenement in Barham? They complain that they have disseised them of one messuage, 40 acres of land and one mark's rent. Hugh and Joan come and say that the assize ought not to be made. He says that Hugh a la Broome, Eutace's and the others' father, once Joan's husband enfeoffed her of the tenements before he married her to hold for all her life and she was placed in full seisin before the marriage ceremony. She produced Hugh's charter which testifies to this.

Eustace and the others say that whatever charter she produces under Hugh's name, he [along] with Joan never had any seisin of the tenements before the marriage ceremony, nor did Hugh's state ever change, rather he died seized. Thus after Hugh's death they succeeded him in the tenements as his sons and heirs. They were in seisin of the tenements as well as in the custody of Joan, until Hugh de la Mare married Joan and ejected them from all the aforesaid. On this they claim the assize.

The jurors say that in fact Hugh a la Broome on the day he married Joan conferred a charter of enfeoffment to Joan concerning the tenements and on the same day married her without Joan [ever] having had any seisin before the marriage ceremony. They say that

³⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Eustace, Odo and the others after Hugh's death were in seisin of the tenements as well as in the custody of Joan their mother, until Hugh de la Mare married Joan. [Thereafter] they completely held them outside the tenements for six years. Wherefore, they say that Hugh and Joan disseised Eustace, Odo and the others of the aforesaid messuage, land and rent. So it is adjudged that Eustace and the others recover their seisin. Hugh [is] in *mercy*. *Damages: 15 marks, 120 shillings.*

B285. Ass. ven. rec. si Willelmus de la Grene et Albreda uxor eius et Johannes de Marisco injuste etc. disseisiverunt Reginaldum de Bocland de libero tenemento suo in Estpreston post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de duabus marcatis redditus cum pertinenciis. Post venit predictus Reginaldus et retraxit se ideo ipse et plegii sui de proseguendo in *misericordia*⁴¹ scilicet Ricardus le Lomere de Mepham et Hugo Coleman de eadem. Postea convenit inter eos scilicet quod predicti Willelmus et Albreda recognoscunt predictum redditum esse jus ipsius Reginaldi et illum ei reddiderunt in eadem curia. Et pro hac (etc.ⁱ) predictus Reginaldus concessit eisdem Willelmo et Albreda medietatem eiusdem redditus percipiendo tota vita ipsius Albrede. Et post mortem ipsius Albrede predicta medietas revertetur ad predictum Reginaldum et heredes suos quietum de predicta Albrede et heredibus suis imperpetuum etc.

B285.[Kent] Did William de la Green and Aubrey his wife and John of Marisco disseise Reginald of Bocland of his free tenement in East Preston? He complains that they have disseised him of two marks rent. Afterwards, Reginald comes and withdraws his suit. He and his pledges [are] in *mercy*, namely Richard le Loomer of Meopham and Hugh Coleman from the same place. Afterwards, it [is] agreed between them, namely that William and Aubrey recognize the rent to be Reginald's and they have rendered it to him in the same court. For this, Reginald grants William and Aubrey half of the rent to collect for all of Aubrey's life. After Aubrey's death that half is to return to Reginald and his heirs quit of Aubrey and her heirs in perpetuity.

B286.(Kant') Ass. ven. rec. si Margeria de Redbrok' et Serlo de Redbrok' injuste etc. disseisiverunt Thomam filium Henrici de libero tenemento suo in Saltwode post primam etc. Et unde queritur quod disseisiverunt eum de medietate xxii acrarum terre cum pertinenciis. Et Margeria et (Thomas^s) veniunt. Et Margeria nichil dicit quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod dicit quod quedam Wymarca feoffavit ipsam de quinque acris terre et dimidia de predicta terra, unde dicit quod si aliqua disseisina ei inde facta fuit hoc fuit per predictum Wymarcam et non per ipsam. Et Serlo dicit quod ipse nichil clamat in alia medietate predicti medietatis totius predictae terre nisi ratione cuiusdam Alani filii Henrici cuius jus et hereditate predicta terra fuit qui est infra etatem et in custodie ipsius Serloni. Et preterea dicunt quod predictus Thomas nunquam aliquam seisinam habuit de predicta terra. Ita quod potuit inde disseisiri. Et de hoc ponunt se super assisam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Thomas nunquam fuit in seisinam de predicta terra in dominico, nisi tantum de decem solidatis annui redditus inde debitis. Et ideo consideratum est quod predicti Margeria et Serlo inde sine die. Et Thomas nichil capiat per assisam istam, set sit in *misericordia*⁴² pro falso clamore.

Post veniunt predicti Serlo et Margeria. Et concedunt pro se et heredibus suis quod ipsi de cetero reddent singulis annis predicto Thome et heredibus suis predictum annuatim redditum x solidorum de predictis tenementis, scilicet predictus Serlo de medietate sua predictae terre v solidos. Et predicta Margeria de alia medietate quam ipsa inde tenet v solidos. Et predictus (Thomasⁱ) tenet se inde contentum etc.

B286.(Kent) Did Marjery of Redbrook and Serle of Redbrook disseise Thomas son of Henry of his free tenement in Saltwood? He complains that they have disseised him of half of 22 acres of land. Marjery and [Serle] come. Marjery says nothing to stop the assize, except only that she says that Wymark enfeoffed her of five and a half acres of land. Wherefore, she says that

⁴¹Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁴²Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

if any disseisin was made to him, it was made by Wymark and not by her. Serle says that he claims nothing in the other half of the aforesaid half, except by reason of custody with Alan son of Henry, who is under age, whose right and inheritance the land was. Moreover, they say that Thomas never had any seisin of the land so that he could be disseised. On this they place themselves on the assize.

The jurors say that Thomas was never in seisin of the land in demesne, except only of ten shillings yearly rent then due. So it is adjudged that Marjery and Serle are without a day. Thomas takes nothing by this assize, but is in *mercy* for false claim.

Afterwards, Serle and Marjery come. They grant for themselves and their heirs that henceforward each year they shall render the 10 shillings rent to Thomas and his heirs, namely Serle for his half of the land 5 shillings and Marjery for the other half which she holds 5 shillings. Thomas holds himself content.

In Octabis Purificacionis Beate Marie apud Westmonasterium.

In the Octaves of the Prurification of the Blessed Mary [9 February 1259] at Westminster.

B287.(Kant') Thomas de Hegham, Bartholomeus, Robertus et Johannes fratres eius queruntur de Willemo le Breton' quondam vicecomite Kant' quod cum ipsi post mortem Roberti de Hegham patris ipsorum successisse debuerunt eidem Roberto in omnibus tenementis suis de quibus obiit seisisit tamquam filii ipsius Roberti et heredes (sine aliqua redempcione facienda secundum consuetudinem Kant'ⁱ), predictus Willelmus tunc vicecomes Kant' iam xx^{ti} annis elapsis non permisit ipsos habere seisinam de terris et tenementis que fuerunt predicti Roberti patris ipsorum in Milsted', Suthingburn' et Haleghstowe que idem Robertus tenuit de domino rege infra hundredum de Middelton' per servicium de gavelikend' quousque Sarra mater ipsorum fecisset finem cum predicto Willelmo per quinquaginta marcas quas ei dedit pro habenda custodia predictorum tenementorum eo quod ipsi fuerunt infra etatem quam quidem pecuniam eadem Sarra percepit de exitibus eorundem tenementorum quos ipsa conservasse debuit et approvasse ad opus ipsorum Thome et aliorum prout decet huiusmodi custodes facere secundum consuetudinem Kant' de consimilibus tenuris, unde dicunt quod deteriorati sunt et dampnum habent ad valenciam centum marcarum. Et inde producant sectam.

Et Willelmus venit et defendet vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendit quod ipse nunquam cepit de predicta Sarra predictas L^a marcas nomine alicuius redempcionis de predictis tenementis, set dicit quod vult cognoscere quandam veritatem. Dicit enim revera quod tempore quo ipse fuit vicecomes cum contigeret aliquem tenentem domini regis in gavelikend' obire ipse similiter percepit de heredibus ipsius pro seisisina habenda de tenementis suis prout alii vicecomites ante tempus suum facere consueverunt. Et bene cognoscit quod ipse post mortem predicti [Roberti] de Hegham patris predictorum Thome et aliorum cepit finem de predicta Sarra pro seisisina habenda de predictis tenementis ad opus predictorum Thome et aliorum, set dicit quod ipse fuit firmarius domini regis de predicto comitatu et quod ipse non fecit aliud quam predecessores sui vicecomites Kant' facere consueverunt et dicit quod ignorat quantum percepit et bene vult quod inquiratur si ipse rationabilem finem recepit vel non.

Et Thomas et alii per attornatum suum dicunt quod nunquam aliquis vicecomites ante tempus predicti Willelmi percipere consuevit huiusmodi fines de tenentibus domini regis de huiusmodi tenuris nec percipere debuerunt secundum consuetudinem Kant'. Et quod idem Willelmus plenarie recepit predictas L^a marcas modo quo predictum est ponunt se super patriam. Et Willelmus similiter. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat in proximo adventu H. le Bygod etc. xii etc. per quos etc. et qui nec etc. Quia tam etc. Et concessum est etc.

Willelmus ponit loco suo Petrum de Tremplesham vel Ricardum de Dayvill'.

B287.[Kent] Thomas of Higham, Bartholomew, Robert and John his brothers complain against William le Breton, once sheriff of Kent, that whereas they after their father Robert of Higham's death ought to succeed him in all his tenements of which he died seized as his sons as well as his heirs without making any relief according to the customs of Kent, William,

then sheriff of Kent, 20 years ago did not allow them to have seisin of the lands and tenements which were Robert's in Milsted, Sittingbourne and Halstow, which [tenements] Robert held of the king within the hundred of Milton Regis by gavelkind, until Sarah, their mother, made fine with William for fifty marks which she rendered for the custody of the tenements, because they were under age. The money which [Sarah rendered] she had collected from the outgoing of their tenements which [money] she ought to have saved and used to improve [the tenements] to their benefit as befits guardians of this kind according to the customs of Kent concerning similar tenures. Wherefore, they say they have suffered damage to the value of one hundred marks. Thereon they produce suit.

William comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that he never took 50 marks from Sarah in the name of any relief for the tenements, but he says that he wishes to know the truth. He also says that for the time when he was sheriff whereas if it happened that any tenant [who held] of the king in gavelkind were to die he collected [a fine] from the heirs to have seisin of the tenements, just as other sheriff before his time were accustomed [to do]. He readily acknowledges that after Robert's death he took a fine from Sarah in return for having seisin of the tenements for Thomas and the others' benefit, but he says that he was the king's farmer from the aforesaid county and he did not do anything which his predecessors as sheriffs of Kent were accustomed [to do]. He says he is ignorant of how much he collected and he clearly wishes that this be examined into to see if he collected a reasonable fine or not.

Thomas and the others through their attorney say that no sheriff before William was accustomed to collect fines of this kind from the king's tenants for these kinds of tenures, nor ought they to collect it according to the custom of Kent. That William fully received the fifty marks as is stated on this they place themselves on the country. William [does] likewise. So the sheriff is ordered to make come at the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod [to these parts] 12 [knights] through whom [the truth might be known] who neither etc. So as etc. It is granted etc.

William appoints as his attorneys Peter of Trapham or Richard of Eyvill.
[Cross-reference: B344, B428]

Kant' [Kent]

Kant'⁴³ [Kent]

[Membrane 16]

Adhuc de Assisis captis apud Cantuar' coram H. le Bygod.

Still Concerning Assizes taken at Canterbury before [Hugh] Bigod.

B288.(T) Ass. ven. rec. si Alicia de Stone mater Johannis filii Alicie fuit seysitus in dominico suo etc. de uno mesuagio, quatuor acris terre et tribus rodibus bosci cum pertinentiis in Frenchestede die quo etc. Et si etc. Que mesuagium, boscum et terram Fulco Peyforer tenet. Qui venit et dicit quod nichil clamat in predictis mesuagio bosco et terra nisi ratione custodie usque ad legitimam etatem predicti Johannis eo quod Alicia mater ipsius Johannis de cuius morte etc. predictam mesuagium, boscum et terram de eo tenuit per servicium militare. Et profert quoddam cyrographum confectum inter ipsum et predictam Aliciam coram R. de Lexinton' et sociis suis justiciariis apud Westmonisterium quod testatur quod predicto Fulco concessit predicta mesuagium boscum et terram predictae Alicie et heredibus suis tenenda de ipso Fulcone per servicium unius paris (cirotecarum⁸) vel unius denarius per annum pro omni servicio. Et quia nulla mencio sit in predicto cyrographo de aliquo servicio militare nisi tantummodo de predicto certo servicio, consideratum est quod predictus Fulco nichil clamare potest in predictis mesuagio, bosco et terra nomine custodie. Et predictus Johannes recuperet saisinam suam per visum recognitorum. Et predictus Fulco in *misericordia*.⁴⁴ Et custodia predictorum mesuagii, bosci et terre simul cum predicto Johanne committantur Willelmo Peper de concilio curie etc.

⁴³The following is at the foot of membrane 15d., in two locations, without an entry mark thus, *ff*.

⁴⁴Margin note by scribe, *mia* crossed out.

B288.[Kent] (T) Was Alice of Stone mother of John son of Alice seized in demesne of one messuage, four acres of land and three rods of woods in Frinsted on the day? Fulk Payforer holds the messuage, wood and land. He comes and says that he claims nothing in the messuage, wood and land, except by reason of custody until John's legitimate age, because Alice, John's mother, held the messuage, wood and land of him by military service. He produced a chirograph⁴⁵ made between him and Alice before [Robert] de Lexington and his colleagues justices at Westminster which testifies that Fulk gave the messuage wood and land to Alice and her heirs to hold of Fulk by service of one pair of gloves or one pence rent for all service. Since no mention is made in the chirograph of any military service, except only the aforesaid fixed service; so it is adjudged that Fulk is able to claim nothing in the messuage, wood and land by custody. John recovers his seisin. Fulk [is] in *mercy*. The custody of the messuage, wood and land along with John is to be committed to William Peper on the recommendation of the court.

B289. Ass. ven. rec. si Ordinarus de Wefindenne pater Alicie filie Ordinari fuit seysitus in dominico etc. de septem acris terre cum pertinenciis in Brenchesle die quo etc. Et si etc. unde Willelmus Cat tres acras terre et Ricardus Gedye tres acras terre et unam rodam et Laurencius de Wefindenne tres rodas terre tenent. Qui veniunt. Et Laurencius de predicta terra versus eum petita vocat ad warrantum Radulfum filium Walteri de Weniton' habeat eum a die Pasche in xv dies apud *Westmonasterium* per auxilium curie. Et summonitur in comitatu *Essex*'. Idem dies datus est omnibus recognitoribus qui veniunt etc. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod habeat corpora eorum ad eundem terminum etc. Et Willelmus Cat de predicta terra versus eum petita vocat ad warrantum predictum Ricardum qui presens est et ei warrantizat. Et tam de terra quam ei warrantizat quam de una acra terre de predicta terra quam tenet vocat ad warrantum Ceciliam filiam et heredem Margerie filie Reginaldi et Matildam et Sibillam filias et heredes Ricardi filii Theyn que sunt infra etatem per cartam predictorum Ricardi et Margerie quam profert de feofamento et que testatur quod iidem Ricardus et Margeria demiserunt et concesserunt ipsi Ricardo predictam terram cum pertinenciis habendam et tenendam eidem Ricardo et heredibus suis de predictis Ricardo et Margerie et heredibus ipsorum imperpetuum. Et quod iidem Ricardus et Margeria et heredes sui warrantizant etc. Et ideo loquela ista quo ad hoc sine die usque ad *etatem* predictorum heredum etc. Et de residuo predictae terre scilicet de duabus acris terre et una roda nichil quare assisa remaneat nisi tantum quod predictus Ordinarus de cuius morte etc. obiit ante terminum in brevi contentum etc.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Ordinarus pater predictae Alicie obiit seysitus de predictis duabus acris et una roda terre (ut de feodo.¹) Et post terminum in brevi contentum. Et quod predicta Alicia propinquior heres eius est. Ideo consideratum est quod predicta Alicia recuperet saisinam suam de predictis duabus [acris] et una roda terre per visum recognitorum. Et predictus Ricardus Gedye in *miserecordia*.⁴⁶

B289.[Kent] Was Otmar of Whitsunden father of Alice daughter of Otmar seized in demesne of seven acres of land in Brenchley on the day? William Cat holds three acres, Richard Gedye three acres and one rod and Laurence of Whitsunden three rods. They come. Laurence concerning the land sought against him calls to warrant Ralph son of Walter of Weddington, he shall have him fifteen days from Easter at *Westminster* by aid of the court. He is to be summoned in *Essex*. The same day is given all the recognitors who came. The sheriff is ordered that he have their bodies at the same term. William Cat concerning the land sought against him calls to warrant the aforesaid Richard, who is present. He warrants him. Concerning the land about which he [just] warranted as well as for one acre of land which he holds, he calls to warrant, by charter of Richard and Marjery which he produced, Cecilia daughter and heir of Marjery daughter of Reginald and Matilda and Sibil daughters and heirs of Richard son of Theyn who are under age. [The charter] concerning the enfeofment testifies that Richard and Marjery demised and granted Richard and his heirs the land to have and to hold of Richard and Marjery and their heirs in perpetuity and that Richard and Marjery

⁴⁵C.P. 25 (1) 96/27/464

⁴⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

and their heirs warrant etc. So this plaint as regards this matter is without a day until the legitimate age of the heirs. Concerning the remainder of the land, namely the two acres and one rod [he says] nothing to stop the assize, except only that Omar died before the term contained in the writ.

The jurors say that Omar father of Alice died seized of the two acres and one rod of land as of fee and after the term contained in the writ. Alice is his nearest heir. So it is adjudged that Alice recovers seisin of the two [acres] and one rod of land. Richard Gedye [is] in mercy.

B290. Preceptum fuit vicecomiti quod venire faciat milites et sectatores de hundredo de Midelton' ad recordandum loquelam que fuit in eodem hundredo inter Agnetem, Emmam et Julianam filias et heredes Willelmi de Wrinedale querentes et Dionisiam que fuit uxor predicti Willelmi tenentem de quinquaginta acris terre et medietate quinque acrarum bosci et triginta solidatis redditus cum pertinenciis in Neuton'. (Et¹) unde predicta Dionisia queritur falsum sibi factum fuisse iudicium in predicto hundredo quia dicit quod cum ipsa post mortem (predicti¹) Willelmi quondam (virri^S) sui esset in plenaria seisin de predictis tenementis ut de dote sua per magnum tempus circiter per x annos et amplius ballivus de Middelton' ad querelam predictarum Agnete, Emme et Juliane ipsam summoneri fecit ad predictum hundredum et cum ibi venisset predictus ballivus ei imponit quod quidam Johannes de Tonecester procreavit ex ea prolem per multum tempus post mortem predicti Willelmi viri sui ob quod ipsa amittere debuit predictam dotem suam secundum consuetudinem illius hundredi. Et ipsa requisita si vellet ponere se inde in inquisicione vel qualiter voluit inde respondere, dixit quod noluit nec debuit ibi de libero tenemento suo sine brevi domini regis respondere cum nullam probacio versus eam secundum consuetudinem predicti hundredi inde prius capta fuisset vel facta. Et idem ballivus nichilominus in absencia sua postquam ipsa recesserat a predicto hundredo cepit inquisicionem illam in forma predicta. Ita quod [leaves off abruptly]

B290.[Kent] The sheriff was ordered to make come the knights and suitors of the hundred of Milton Regis to record the plaint which was in the hundred [court] between the plaintiffs Agnes, Emma and Juliana daughters and heirs of William of Wormdale and Denise who was the wife of the aforesaid William [and] tenant of fifty acres of land, half of five acres of woods and thirty shillings rent in Newington. Denise complains that false judgement was given her in the hundred, since she says that after William's death she was in full seisin of the tenements as her dower for a long time, nearly 10 years and more, [when] the bailiff of Milton Regis at Agnes', Emma's and Juliana's complaint summoned her to the hundred [court]. When she came there the bailiff alleged that John of Towcester begat a child of her sometime after William's death, as a consequence of which she ought to lose her dower according to the customs of this hundred. She was [then] asked if she wished to place herself on the inquiry or how she wished to answer. She said that she does not nor ought she respond there for her free tenement without a writ, since no proof according to the customs of the hundred was previously taken against her, nor made [against her]. Nonetheless, the bailiff after she had left the hundred [court] took the inquiry in the aforesaid manner. So [Cross-reference: B266]

B291.(Kant') Ricardus de Shotingdon' et Albina uxor eius queruntur de Amicie Chich' quod cum custodia (terrarum et¹) Johannis et Johanne filiorum et heredum Anselini de Ripple ad ipsam Albinam pertineat secundum consuetudinem Kant' eo quod ipsa propinquior predictis heredibus ex parte Johanne matris ipsorum (et¹) cui hereditas predicta nullo modo descendere potuit predicta Amicia detinet eis predictam custodiam et heredes predictos eis reddere contredicit etc.

Postea in octabis Purificacionis Beate Marie apud Westmonasterium veniunt predicti Ricardus et Albina et predicta Amicia. Et concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis, scilicet quod predicti Ricardus et Albina remiserunt et quietumclamaverunt de se quantum ad isam Albinam pertinet totum jus et clameum quod habuit in predicta custodia imperpetuum. Et pro hac etc. predicta Amicia dat eisdem Ricardo et Albina viginti et quinque marcas de quibus eis solvet (medietatas¹) ad Pascha anno xliii et aliam medietatem ad festum Sancti Michaelis proximo sequens. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

B291.(Kent) Richard of Shoddington and Albina his wife complain against Amy Chich that since the custody of Anselm of Ripple's lands and his children and heirs, John and Joan, belongs to Albina according to the customs of Kent, because she is the heirs nearest [relative] on their mother Joan's side and the inheritance in no way can descend, Amy, [nonetheless], withholds the custody and heirs and refuses to render them.

Afterwards in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] at Westminster Richard and Albina and Amy come. They are agreed by licence. The agreement [is] as such; namely that Richard and Albina remit and quitclaim themselves of all right and claim which Albina had in the custody in perpetuity. For this, Amy gives Richard and Albina twenty-five marks of which she shall render half at Easter year 43 [13 April 1259] and the other half at the following feast of Saint Michael [29 September]. If she does not, she grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from her lands.

[Membrane 17 (membrane 16d. is blank)]

B292.(Kant', T) Bonefacius Archiepiscopus Cantuar' summonitus fuit ad respondendum Priori Ecclesie Christi Cantuar' de placito quare deforciat eidem Priori habere retorum brevium domini regis in terris et feodis suis sicut predecessores sui habere consueverunt tempore domini regis nunc. Et quare non permittit ipsum Priorem attachiamenta facere per brevia domini regis in terris et feodis suis catalla fugitivorum, dampnatorum et amerciamenta hominum suorum capere et aliis libertatibus suis uti sunt predecessores sui temporibus predecessorum domini regis Regum Anglie et tempore domini regis nunc facere consueverunt etc. Et unde predictus Prior dicit quod quidam Rogerus predecessor eius quondam Prior predictae ecclesie tempore domini regis nunc habere consuevit retorum brevium domini regis in omnibus terris et feodis suis. Et similiter quidam Nicholaus quondam Prior eiusdem ecclesie predecessor eius habuit retorum brevium domini regis in terris et feodis suis tempore domini regis nunc, usque iam decem annis elapsis scilicet ad ultimum iter H. de Bathon' et socorum suorum in comitatu isto quando predictus Archiepiscopus deforciat eidem Nicholao predecessori suo retorum brevium predictorum, nec etiam permisit eundem Priorem attachiamenta facere per predicta brevia in terris et feodis suis nec catalla fugitivorum, dampnatorum et amerciamenta hominum suorum capere, nec aliis libertatibus uti unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam mille librarum. Et inde producit sectam. Et profert cartam domini W. regis conquestoris in hec verba, W. dei gracia etc. Sciatis me dedisse Anselino Archiepiscopo Archiepiscopatum Cantuar' Ecclesie cum omnibus libertatibus et dignitatibus ad Archiepiscopum Cant' pertinentem et saca et socne, onstrande et onstrem, on wodem et on welden, tholonem et theames, Grithbresche, hamsocne, forestalles et infongenethenes et flemenenremthe et omnes alias libertates in terra et in mari, super suos homines infra burgos et extra et super tot chemes quot ecclesie Christi concessit Rex Edwardus cognatus meus, volo etiam ut monachi ecclesie Christi Cant' similiter habeant in omnibus terris et tenementis suis omnes predictas libertates in terra et in mari in aquis et vivariis et omnibus aliis locis et omnibus rebus que ad eos pertinent, in tantum et tam pleniter sicut proprii ministri mei (exquirere^s) debent etc. Et nolo pati ut aliquis hominum se intromittat de omnibus rebus que ad eos pertinent, nisi ipsi et ministri eorum quibus ipsi committere voluerunt, nec Francus, nec Anglicus etc. Profert etiam cartam (predicti¹) Anselini tunc temporis Archiepiscopi Cant' in hec verba, Anselinus dei gratia etc. Notum sit vobis me concessisse et confirmasse monachis in ecclesia michi commissa deo servientibus omnes res et possessiones suas sicut rex Willelmus concessit et confirmavit honorifice, libere et integre possidendas in perpetuum, concedo etiam ad meam et successorum meorum et illorum quietem et perpetuam pacem ut ipsi libere disponant et ordinent de rebus que ad eos pertinent sicut eis melius et utilius visum fuerit de communi consilio capituli sui, quatinus sicut easdem habemus in possessionibus libertates, similem habeamus in porcionibus potestatem, salva michi et successoribus meis regulari disciplina etc.

Et Archiepiscopus venit et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et dicit quod non debet ei inde ad hoc breve nec ad aliquod aliud breve in curia domini regis respondere, quia dicit quod predictus Prior non est Prior perpetuus, immo amobilis pro voluntate sua, eo quod ipse

est capud ecclesie Cantuar' et loco abbatis ipsorum monachorum predicte ecclesie, et sicut Abbas non tenetur respondere in aliquo suo Priori in curia regis contra voluntatem suam, ita nec ipse eidem Priori debet respondere. Dicit enim quod omnes predecessores sui Archiepiscopi Cant' amovere solebant Priores in predicto Prioratu tamquam abbates eiusdem et similiter celerarios sacristas et omnes alios obedientiaros eiusdem Prioratus pro voluntate ipsorum sine alicuius cause cognitione vel delicto. Et quod ipsemet tempore suo (eodem modo¹) amovit quendam Rogerum de la Legh' predecessorem ipsius Prioris et similiter quendam alium Priorem Nicholaum de Sandwico nomine et post ipsum contulit ipse Prioratum predictum isti Rogero qui modo est Prior ex officio suo et quem amovere potest et deponere pro voluntate sua. Et dicit quod nunquam retroactis temporibus aliquis Prior predicti Prioratus inplacitavit aliquem Archiepiscopum predecessorem suum in curia domini regis de aliquibus terris vel tenementis seu rebus temporalibus immo ipsi semper singulas injurias et transgressiones a predictis Archiepiscopis predecessoris suis (vel ballivis eorum¹) eis illatas exponere consueverunt ipsis Archiepiscopis tamquam abbatibus ipsorum et capitibus predicti Prioratus qui causa conservacionis eiusdem domus sue inducti et non brachio seculari compulsi easdem injurias et transgressiones emendari fecerunt tam in temporalibus quam in spiritualibus. Dicit etiam quod nunquam aliquis Prior predicti Prioratus aliquid de terris vel tenementis eiusdem Prioratus alienare potuit sive aliquid inde conferre alicui sine assensu et voluntate predecessorum suorum Archiepiscoporum Cant' vel sui. Et dicit quod tempore confeccionis predicte carte quam proferunt sub nomine predicti W. Regis conquestoris non fuit ibi aliquis Prior (et hoc patet¹) eo quod non sit mencio de aliquo Priore in predicta carta, immo solummodo de monachiis. Dicit etiam quod bona eiusdem Prioratus semper fuerunt sub ordinacione et confirmacione sua et predecessorum suorum, eo quod ipsi per voluntatem suam hucusque usi sunt recipere compotum de Celariis, sacristis et aliis obedientiariis eiusdem domus de omnibus receptoribus suis et exponere factis ita quod bona eorundem monachorum nunquam separata fuerunt de bonis suis et predecessorum suorum quominus extiterunt sub ordinacione et disponicione eorundem, unde dicit quod non debet ei ad hoc breve vel ad aliquod aliud breve respondere.

Et Prior dicit quod ipse perpetuus est et omnes predecessores sui Priores perpetui fuerunt, nec unquam amoti vel depositi per aliquem Archiepiscopum nisi pro certo delicto et causa cognita vel spontanea voluntate sua et quod omnia bona sua ita separata habuerit quod hucusque usi sunt placitare in curia domini regis et alibi (tam¹) de rebus suis mobilibus quam immobilibus petendo terras et tenementa et similiter respondere de terris et tenuris suis sine assensu vel contradicione alicuius Archiepiscopi Cant' et terras et tenementa in curia regis per iudicium recuperare et amittere et similiter per fines inter predecessores suos Priores predicte ecclesie et alios in curia regis confectos pluries retinere, et aliis concedere. Et profert diversos fines inter predecessores suos et alios confectos in curia regis coram diversis justiciariis, scilicet quendam finem confectum in curia domini regis coram Roberto de Lexinton', Willelmo de Ebor' et sociis suis justiciariis apud Westmonasterium anno xxii, inter Johannem Priorem Sancte Trinitatis Cant' petentem et Willelmum de Longo Campo tenetem de duabus carucatis terre cum pertinenciis in Stisted' in comitatu Essex per quem finem idem Prior recognovit totam predictam terram cum pertinenciis esse jus ipsius Willelmi pro sex decimis libris annuatim reddendis eidem Priori et successoribus suis etc. Et quendam alium confectum in curia domini regis coram H. de Bathon', Alano de Wassand et sociis suis justiciariis itinerantibus apud Lewes, anno xxxiii, inter Willelmum de Wendleswurthe querentem et Nicholaum Priorem Sancte Trinitatis Cant' impeditum de L^a et duabus acris terre cum pertinenciis in Merston' per quem finem predictus Prior recognovit predictam terram cum pertinenciis esse jus ipsius Willelmi ut illam quam idem Willelmus habet de dono ipsius Prioris habendam et tenendam eidem Willelmo et heredibus suis de predicto Priore et successoribus suis etc. inperpetuum, reddendo inde per annum xii denarios etc. Et similiter quamplurima alia placita in diversis locis sepius secuti sunt versus alios et alii versus eos de terris et tenementis suis et in presencia ipsius Archiepiscopi et predecessorum suorum irrequisito assensu eorundem et absque aliqua calumpnia vel clamio quod iidem Archiepiscopi approuerunt. Et quo ad hoc quod dicit quod nunquam aliquis Prior Cant' inplacitavit aliquem Archiepiscopum usque nunc dicit quod nunquam antea aliquis Prior necesse habuit implacitare aliquem predecessorem suorum quousque iste Archiepiscopus deforciabat predecessoris ipsius Prioris habere retorna brevium domini regis et alias libertates

(suasⁱ) in terris et feodis suis sicut predictum est, unde ipsum Archiepiscopum modo inplacitat. Et de hoc quod idem Archiepiscopus dicit quod amovit predictum Nicholaum predecessore ipsius Prioris pro voluntate sua, dicit predictus Prior quod idem Nicholaus predecessor eius spontanea voluntate sua se demisit et profert litteras predicti Archiepiscopi patentes per quas idem Archiepiscopus testatur quod ad frequentem petitionem eiusdem Nicholai amovit ipsum. Et quod ipse et omnes predecessores sui semper a conquestu Anglia habuerunt terras et tenementa et alia bona sua seperata a terris et bonis omnium Archiepiscoporum Cantuar' et inde ordinaverunt et disposuerunt pro voluntate sua et versus quoscumque placitaverunt in curia domini regis et alibi cum necesse habuerunt sine assensu vel contradiccione eorundem Archiepiscoporum et etiam quod omnes predecessores sui ita perpetui semper extiterunt quod nullus Archiepiscopus aliquem ipsorum amovit nisi esset ex mera voluntate ipsorum vel ob certum delictum aut alicuius cause cognicione, paratus est verificare per patriam, si curia consideraverit quod inquiri debeat.

Dies datus eis in octabis Purificacionis Beate Marie coram domino rege ubicumque etc. In eodem statu in quo nunc etc. prece parcium etc. Et Prior ponit loco suo fratrem Walterum de Hatfeld monachum suum vel Julianum de Bersted'.

Postea ad diem illum apud Templum Novum London' venit predictus Prior et optulit se ⁱⁱⁱⁱOr (dieⁱ) versus predictum Archiepiscopum. Et ipse non venit etc. Et visus fuit in curia et recessit sine licencia justiciarii. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod (venire^{ul}) faciat eum venire a die Pasche in xv dies coram R. ubicumque etc. ad audiendum recordum etc.

B292.(Kent, T) Boniface the Archbishop of Canterbury was summoned to answer the prior of Christ Church Canterbury concerning a plea whereby he deforced the prior of the return of writs on lands and fees which the prior and his predecessors were accustomed to have during the present king's time. And [to answer a plea] whereby the archbishop did not allow the prior to make the attachments arising from the writs on his lands and fees [nor] collect the chattels of fugitives [and] the condemned [nor collect] the amercements from his men or use his other liberties which his predecessors were accustomed to use during the reigns of previous king's of England and during the present king's time. The prior says that Roger, his predecessor, during the present king's time was accustomed to have the return of writs on all his lands and fees. Likewise, Nicholas, once prior of the church and his predecessor, had the return of writs on all his lands and fees during the present king's time, until ten years ago, namely up to the eyre of [Henry] de Bath and his colleagues, when the archbishop deforced Nicholas of the return of writs, nor did he allow the prior to make the attachments arising through the writs on his lands and fees, nor collect the chattels of fugitives [and] the condemned [nor collect] amercements from his men nor use the other liberties. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of one thousand pounds. Thereon he produces suit. He produced a charter of [William] the Conqueror in these words: [William] by grace of God etc. Know that I have given to Anselm Archbishop of the Archbishopric of Canterbury *sake and soke, onstrande and onstrem, on woden and on welden*, toll and team, *grithbresche, hamscone, forestalles, infongenthes and flemenremthe* and all other liberties on the land and on the water over his men within the tithings and outside and upon all ways which King Edward, my relative, gave the Christ Church; I also wish as monks of Christ Church Canterbury [that] they shall likewise have the aforesaid liberties on all their lands and tenements on the land and in the sea, waters and streams and all on places and all things which pertain to them in full as if it were my own to execute. I do not wish any men to interfere in these things which belong to them, unless they and their ministers wish to commit them to them, neither French nor English. He also produced a charter of Anselm's, at that time archbishop of Canterbury, in these words: Anselm by grace of God etc. Note this, I myself have granted and conferred to the monks in my church, trusted servants of God, to posses in perpetuity all their things and possessions just as King William honourifically, freely and fully granted and conferred. I also grant to mine and my successors and theirs quit and perpetual peace so that they may freely dispose and order concerning [those] things which pertain to them just as would seem best and useful to them by common counsel of their chapter, just as we have these same liberties in possessions we will have similar power in portions, saving me and my successors regular discipline.

The archbishop comes and denys force and injury. He says that he ought not to answer

this writ or any other writ in the king's court. He says that the prior is not the prior for ever, rather [he is] removeable at his will, because he is the head of the church of Canterbury and the abbot of the monks of the church. As the abbot he is not held to answer against his will for anything involving his prior in the king's court, he need not nor ought he answer the prior. He says that all his predecessors as archbishops of Canterbury were, at their own will without any known cause or offence, accustomed to remove the priors from the priory as abbots of the same, likewise the cellarers and sacristans and all other obedeiraries of the priory. He himself in this way removed Roger de la Leigh, this prior's predecessor, likewise [he removed] a certain Nicholas of Sandwich and after him he gave the priory to this Roger, who is now prior through his office and whom he can remove and displace at his own will. He says that no rector, during any rectorship of the priory, ever pleaded any archbishop in the king's court concerning his lands, tenements or temporal things. Rather, they were always accustomed to explain to the archbishops as their abbots and heads of the priory each injury and transgression done by the archbishops or their bailiffs, who, for the sake of preserving their house and not forced by the secular arm, amended [these] temporal as well as spiritual injuries and transgressions. He also says that no prior of the priory was ever able to alienate any lands or tenements belonging to the priory or to confer anything without his consent or will or that of his predecessors as archbishops of Canterbury. He says that during the time when the charter, which the prior produced under [William] the Conqueror's name, was made there was no prior there. This is clear because there is no mention of any prior in the charter, rather only [references] to monks. He also says that the goods of the priory were always under his ordination and confirmation and that of his predecessors, because they at their own will and to this point have received the accounts from the cellarers, sacristans and other obedensieraries of the house concerning all their recepits and expenses incurred. Thus the monks goods were never separte from his goods and those of his predecessors by which the less they stood under their ordination and disposition. Wherefore, he says that he ought not to answer this writ or any other.

The prior comes and says he is the perpetual prior and all his predecessors were perptual priors, nor were they ever removed or disposed of by any archbishop or at their will, except for certain offences and known causes. [He says] he has had all his goods seperately [and] that to this point they have used the king's court, and elsewhere, to plead concerning his moveables as well immoveables [and] to claim lands and tenements. Likewise, [he has used the king's court and elsewhere] to answer for his lands and tenures without the assent or contradiction of any archbishop. By verdict of the king's court [he and his predecessors have] recovered and lost lands and tenements, and likewise by fines made in the king's court between his predecessors and others [they have] fully upheld and granted [lands and tenements]. He produced various fines made in the king's court between his predecessors and others before various judges, namely a certain fine made in the king's court before Robert of Lexington, William of York and their colleagues, justices at Westminster year 22 [1237-1238], between the plaintiff John the prior of Saint Trinity's Canterbury and William Longchamp, a tenant of two carucates of land in Stilsted in the county of Essex, by which fine the prior recognized the whole land to be William's right for sixty pounds yearly rent to the prior and his successors. [He produced] another fine made in the king's court before [Henry] de Bath, Alan of Watsand and their colleagues justices itinerant at Lewes year 33 [1248-1249], between the plaintiff, William of Wandsworth, and the defendant, Nicholas the prior of Saint Trinity's Canterbury, concerning fifty-two acres of land in Merston by which fine the prior recognized the land to be William's and his heirs' as that which William had as a gift from the priors to have and to hold of the prior and his successors in perpetuity, to render 12 pence per year. Likewise [he can produce countless] other pleas sued in various places against others and others against them concerning their lands and tenements and in the prescence of the archbishop and his predecessors regardless of their assent and without any complaint or claim having been put forth by them. He says that as regards the following, that no prior of Canterbury ever pleaded any archbishop until then, he says that it was never neccesary for any prior to plead the archbishop's predecessors until this archbishop deforced this prior's predecessors of the return of writs and his other liberties on the lands and fees, as is stated above. Wherefore, he now pleads the archbishop. Concerning this, that the archbishop says that he removed Nicholas at his own will, he says that Nicholas resigned at his own will and he produced letters patent from the archbishop by which he testifies that as a

result of Nicholas' frequent requests he removed him. That he and all his predecessors, from the time of the conquest of England, always had lands and tenements and other goods separately from the lands and goods of all the archbishops' of Canterbury and [that] they ordained and disposed of them at their own will and towards whomever they pleaded in the king's court and elsewhere as necessity dictated without the assent or contradiction of the archbishops and also that all his predecessors always stood permanently [so] that no archbishop removed any of them, except at their own will or for certain offences or other known causes; [this] he stands ready to verify by the country, if the court considers it ought to be examined.

A day is given them in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] wherever the king shall be. In the same state as it is now by the prayers of both parties. The prior appoints as his attorneys brother Walter of Hatfield, his monk, or Julian of Bearsted.

Afterwards on that day at the New Temple London the prior comes and puts in an appearance on the fourth day against the archbishop. He has not come. He was seen at the court and he departed without a licence from the justiciar. So the sheriff is ordered to make him come before the king 15 days from Easter to hear his judgement.

[Membrane 18, (membrane 17d is blank)]

Placita de Querelis coram Hugone le Bygod Justiciario Anglie apud Cantuar', die Dominica proximo ante festum Sancti Hillarii, anno xliii.

Pleas Concerning Complaints before Hugh Bigod, Justiciar of England, at Canterbury on the First Sunday before the Feast of Saint Hillary Year 43 [12 January 1259].

[Eyborne Hundred]

B293.(Kant', die Martis) Juratores presentant quod homines Abbatis Sancti Augustini de Clopham et Stoneacre subtraxerunt se de sectis faciendis ad hundredum domini regis de Eyhorn. Et similiter homines eiusdem Abbatis de (Hedecrone^{ul}) Bedemanton', Thenechvolde et Hesden' subtraxerunt se de eadem secta. Et etiam homines Magisteri Hospitale de Ospreng' de Hedecrone eodem modo subtraxerunt se de huiusmodi secta tempore domini regis nunc, scilicet homines Abbatis de Clopham et Stonacre de tempore decem annorum predictorum. Et homines aliarum villarum de tempore xxx^{la} annorum. Et homines predicti Magisteri de septem annis elapsis. Et super hoc venit senescallus abbatis et petit diem quod abbas venire possit ad respondendum etc. Post venit predictus Magister et protulit cartam domini regis in qua continetur quod ipse et homines ipsius Magisteri de Hodecrone quieti sint de sectis comitatu et hundredo etc.

B293.(Kent, Tuesday) The jurors present that the abbot of Saint Augustine's men from Clapham and Stoneacre withdrew themselves from suit to the king's hundred of Eyborne. Likewise, the abbot's men from Bedmonton, Thanet Wood and Hexden have withdrawn themselves from the same suit. Also the master of the Hospital of Ospringe's men from Headcorn withdrew themselves in the same way from this type of suit during the present king's time, namely the abbot's men from Clapham and Stoneacre [withdrew] ten years ago. The men from the other villis [withdrew] some 30 years ago and the master's men seven years ago. Concerning the above the abbot's seneschal comes and claims a day when the abbot is able to come and answer. Afterwards, the master came and showed a royal charter which contained [the grant] that he and his men from Headcorn were quit concerning suit to the county and the hundred [courts].

B294. Item presentant quod homines Archiepiscopi Cantuar' de Mergat' et Stretton' subtraxerunt se de sectis faciendis ad predictum hundredum, iam xx annis elapsis quas prius facere consueverunt veniat Archiepiscopus *die Martis*.

B294. They also present that the archbishop of Canterbury's men from Margate and Stretton withdrew themselves from suit to the hundred 20 years ago, whereas they were previously

accustomed [to make suit]. The archbishop shall come on *Tuesday*.

B295.(Loquendum) Presentant etiam quod Johannes de Wadeton' dum fuit vicecomes levavit quandam consuetudinem in hundredo isto, scilicet quod cepit ad duos turnos suos per annum xxxii solidos quod vocatur Lethysot quod quidam singuli vicecomes (semperⁱ) postea perceperunt hucusque. Et Johannes venit et dicit quod ipse aliquo tempore fuit subvicecomes Bertrami de Crioll', set nunquam vicecomes et quod ipse (nichilⁱ) cepit (et si quidam tempore suo captum fuitⁱ) hoc fuit ad opus ipsius Bertrami et non ad opus suum, hoc idem presentatum est in hundredo de Larkef'. Et similiter in singulo hundredo totius comitatu presentatum est quod idem Johannes ceperit annuatim in singulo hundredo ad turnos suos terciam porcionem secundum plus et minus secundum quantitatem hundredi. Et similiter omnes vicecomites subsequentes, ita quod modo arentatum est. Ideo inde *loquendum* cum domino rege.

B295.(Discussed) They also present that John of Watton, while he was sheriff, raised a certain custom in this hundred, namely that he took at his two tourns per year 32 shillings called 'lethysot' which each sheriff afterwards always collected. John comes and says that he was once a sub-sheriff to Bertram of Crioil, but never a sheriff and he took nothing. If [the money] was taken during his time it was to Bertram's benefit and not his. This is presented in the hundred of Larkfield. Likewise, it is presented throughout each hundred of the entire county that John took a third portion from each hundred at his two tourns, more or less according to the size of the hundred. Likewise, all the subsequent sheriffs assess it that way. So it is to be *discussed* with the king.

B296. Item dicunt quod ballivi istius hundredi tempore domini regis nunc levaverunt de novo consuetudinem, scilicet quod perceperunt ad suos lawedayes aliquando unam marcam aliquando plus. Ita quod modo percipiunt singulis annis ad duos lawedayes xl solidos et ad terminum laweday i marcam. Eodem modo presentatum est de ballivis hundredi de Larkefeld' quod percipiunt ad duos lawedayes per annum xx solidos. Eodem modo presentatum est in singulo hundredo totius comitatus. Ita quod modo quasi arentatum est. Ideo inde *loquendum* cum domino rege.

B296. They also say that the bailiffs of this hundred, during the present king's time, recently raised a new custom, namely that they have collected on their lawdays from some one mark and from others more. In this way they collect each year at the two lawdays 40 shillings and at the end of a lawday 1 mark. The same thing is presented concerning the bailiffs from the hundred of Larkfield that they collect at the two lawdays 20 shillings. The same is presented by each hundred of the county. Thus it is as if it was a rent. So it is to be *discussed* with the king.

B297. Johannes de Seyncler coronator in *miser cordia*⁴⁷ pro contemptu curie. Et similiter Bartholomeus de Otteringbir' C[oronor].

B297. John of Seyncler a coroner [is] in *mercy* for contempt of court. [So is] Bartholomew of Otterbury a c[oroner].

B298. Juratores presentant quod singuli coronatores istius comitatus capiunt mercedes pro visibus mortuorum faciendis, scilicet Bartholomeus de Oteringbur' et Johannes de Seyncler qui fuerunt coronatores post ultimum iter justiciariorum. Ideo ipsi in *miser cordia*.⁴⁸

B298. The jurors present that each coroner of this county took rewards for view of the dead, namely Bartholomew of Otterbury and John Seyncler who were coroners after the last eyre of the justices [itinerant]. So they [are] in *mercy*.

⁴⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴⁸Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

B299. Convictum est quod Gwydo de Norton fregit domum Ricardi Cope injuste et ipsum cepit (et abduxit⁴⁹) apud Castrum Dover'. Ideo predictus Gwido committatur *gaole*⁴⁹. Et satisfaciat eidem Ricardo de dampnis suis, si (Ricardus¹) veniat. Et similiter convictum est quod idem Gwido simul cum Willelmo de Halsmode fregit domum Willelmi Hutte injuste et in ea cepit unum ensem, unum arcum et duas gallinas et ea asportavit. Ideo in misericordia. Et committatur *gaole* et faciat restitutionem predicto Willelmo etc. Post venit predictus Gwydo et finem fecit pro omnibus transgressionibus suis dum fuit ballivus quantum ad predictum dominum regem pertinet per *c solidos*⁵⁰ per plegium Johannis de Tonge, Radulfi de Derby et Ernaldi de Eslinge.

B299. It is determined that Guy of Norton destroyed Richard Cope's house and seized him and led him to Dover Castle. So Guy is to be committed to *gaol*. He shall satisfy Richard of his damages if Richard comes. Likewise, it is determined that Guy along with William of Halsmode destroyed William Hutte's house and took from it one sword, one bow and two hens and carried [them] off. So he [is] in mercy. He is to be committed to *gaol* and he shall make restitution to William. Afterwards, by pledge of John of Tonge, Ralph of Derby and Ernald of Eastling, Guy came and made fine for *100 shillings* for all his transgressions [committed] while he was bailiff, in as much as pertains to the king.

B300. Hamo de Detling' queritur de Thoma de Hulinge quod idem Thomas ipsum verberavit in capite ita quod duas dentes amisit. Et Thomas defendit totum. Et ponit se super juratam. Et juratores dicunt quod predictus Thomas nullam transgressionem fecit predicto Hamoni. Ideo Thomas inde quietus. Et Hamo pauper est.

B300. Hamo of Detling complains against Thomas of Uting that Thomas beat him on the head, thus he lost two teeth. Thomas denies all. He places himself on the jury. The jurors say that Thomas made no transgression to Hamo. So Thomas is quit. Hamo is poor.

B301. Rogerus de Mosewell' in *misericordia*⁵¹ pro falso calmore versus Rogerum Killun et quia retraxit se versus Radulfum de Sancto Leodegario.

B301. Roger of Mosewell [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Roger Kilham and beacuse he withdrew himself against Ralph of Saint Leodegario.

B302. Willelmus le Enveyse queritur de Willelmo de Detling' quod idem Willelmus detinet ei xl solidos quos ei debet de quadam convencione inter eos facta etc. Et Willelmus venit et defendit totum etc. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Juratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Willelmus de Detling' in nullo tenetur predicto Willelmo. Ideo ipse inde sine die. Et Willelmus le Envesyse pauper est.

B302. William le Enveise complains of William of Detling that William withheld 40 shillings from him which he owes him for an agreement made between them. William comes and denies all. On this he places himself on the country.

The jurors say upon their oath that William of Detling is not held to William. So he is without a day. William le Enveise is poor.

B303. Juratores presentant quod Rogerus de Shelve clericus fecit quandam pupresturam in regia via apud Shelve. Ideo predicta via aperiatur quantum fuerit ad nocumentum patrie, et ad custum ipsius Rogeri. Et ipse in *misericordia*.⁵²

B303. The jurors present that Roger of Shelve a clerk made a certain perpresture on the royal way at Shelve. So the way is to be opened at Roger's cost in as much as it was to the

⁴⁹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁵⁰Margin note by scribe, c. s. crossed out.

⁵¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

nuisance to the country. He [is] in *mercy*.

B304. Juratores presentant quod regia via in Otham juxta molendinum Petri de Otham obstructa est et deteriorata est ob defectum reperacionis stagni ipsius Petri. Ideo dictum est predicto Petro quod reperari faciat etc.

B304. The jurors present that the royal way in Otham, next to the mill of Peter of Otham, is obstructed and damaged through lack of repairs to Peter's pond. So it is said to Peter that he make the [required] repairs.

B305. Juratores presentant quod consuetudo hucusque habebatur in hundredo isto, scilicet quod quamplures distringunt (alios⁵³) in nundine et mercatis pro debitis aliorum quorum plegiorum non extiterunt sine principales debitores. Et ipsi plenius quesiti qui huiusmodi districcione fecerunt, dicunt super sacramentum suum quod Godinus Vinetarius de Sithingeburn' distinxit Ricardum del Brok' et quosdam alios homines et liberos tenentes Hugoni de Cresy pro debito ipsius Hugoni cuius plegii non extiterant. Et Ricardus de Green et Robertus Godwyne ballivi de Roffa distrinxerunt Ricardum le Scryveyn de Roffa per quendam equum suum pro debito cuiusdam vicini sui cuius plegius non extiterat. Ideo ipsi in *misericordia*.⁵³ Et super hoc testatum est per totum comitatum quod huiusmodi consuetudino hucusque habebatur in comitato isto. Et ideo provisum est et statutum et etiam inhibitum ex parte domini regis quod nullus de cetero distringat alium pro debito alterius nisi fuerit plegius eius de debito illo et hoc si principalis debitor non sufficiat ad predictum debitum reddendum. Et si sufficiat tunc plegius non distringatur dum modo debitor habeat unde reddere possit. Et hoc de cetero teneatur per totum comitatum excepto civitatibus et burgis in quibus licitum est singulis civibus et mercatoribus alios cives et mercatores aliarum civitatum et burgorum distringere pro debitis aliorum secundum legem et consuetudinem mercatorum.

B305. The jurors present that the custom up to this point in this hundred was as such that many persons have distrained others at the fair and markets for the debts of others whose pledges have not stood without the principal debtors. They were fully examined as to who made distrains of this kind. They say upon their oath that Godinus Vintner of Sittingbourne distrained Richard del Brook and certain other men and free tenants of Hugh of Cressy for Hugh's debt whose pledges had not stood. Richard of Green and Robert Godwin, bailiffs of Rochester, distrained Richard le Scrivein of Rochester through his horse for his neighbour's debt, whose pledge had not stood. So they [are] in *mercy*. Concerning this it is testified by the whole county that this kind of custom, up to now, is being used in the county. So it is provided and statuted and also prohibited on the part of the king that no one shall henceforward distrain another for another's debt unless he is a pledge of his for that debt and this [maybe done only] if the principal debtor does not have enough to clear the debt; if he has then the pledge is not to be distrained provided that the debtor is able to clear himself. Henceforward, this is to be held throughout the county, excepting the towns and boroughs in which it is lawful to distrain each townsmen and merchant and other townsmen and merchants for another's debts according to the law and custom of the markets.

B306. Willelmus le Enveyse et Elurich' de Ledes in *misericordia*⁵⁴ pro magna transgressione versus Thomam de Holinges.

B306. William le Enveise and Ulrich of Leeds [are] in *mercy* for a serious transgression against Thomas of Ulting.

B307. Egidius de Grenherst in *misericordia*⁵⁵ pro contemptu curie.

B307. Giles of Greenhurst [is] in *mercy* for contempt of court.

⁵³Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁵⁴Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁵⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

- B308.(Kant') Ricardus de la Dene ponit loco suo Laurencium de Dene fratrem eius versus Willelmum de la Dene de placito transgressionis.
- B308.(Kent) Richard de la Dean appoints as his attorney his brother Laurence of Dean against William de la Dean concerning a plea of trespass.
- B309. Nicholaus de Crioll' ponit loco suo Rogerum Hikedod versus Thomam de Frenchenested' de placito transgressionis.
- B309. Nicholas of Crioil appoints as his attorney Roger Hikedod against Thomas of Frinsted concerning a plea of trespass.
- B310.(Hundredo de Ho) Dyonisia de Boclaunde et Johannes Parlebeu in *misericordia*⁵⁶ pro pluribus et enormibus transgressionibus etc.
- B310.(Hundred of Hoo) Denise of Bocland and John Parlebeu [are] in *mercy* for numerous grave transgressions.
- B311.(Kant') Isaac de Kingeston' ponit loco suo Stephanum de Wymelingewald' versus Robertum filium Willelmi de Kybesy de placito terre.
- B311.(Kent) Isaac of Kingston appoints as his attorney Stephen of Womenswold against Robert son of William of Kybesy concerning a land plea.
- [Membrane 18d.]

Hundredum de Larkefeld'

The Hundred of Larkfield

- B312. Convictum est per juratam in quam Willelmus de la Grene quondam ballivus Willelmi de Say se posuit quod idem Willelmus pluries extorsit ad hominibus ipsius Willelmi de Say de Borham et Berling' bona sua graviter eos amerciando et pro parvis delictis. Et similiter quod cepit fines ab eis pro custodia habendis de terris que tenentur in gavelikend' ad quas nullam custodiam pertinet ad opus dominorum feodorum nisi tantum ad commodum heredum. Ideo Willelmus in *misericordia*.⁵⁷ Et satisfaciat [leaves off abruptly]
- B312. It is determined by the jury on which William de la Green, once William of Say's bailiff, placed himself that William [de la Green] numerous times extorted goods from William of Say's men of Burham and Birling [and] gravely amerced them for petty offences. Likewise, to the benefit of his lords fees he took fines from the men to have custody of land which they held in gavelkind to which no custody pertains, except only to the heir. So William [is] in *mercy*. He shall
- B313. Convictum est per juratam quod Dionisius de la Bokeland' ballivus cepit de hominibus de Borga de Eylesford' xxxiii solidos et iiiiii^{or} denarios pro xx^{ti} solidis ad quos amerciati fuerunt coram justiciariis. Et juratores quesiti ad opus cuius cepit predictos denarios, dicunt quod idem Dionisius soluit inde Ricardo de Grey domino suo x solidos et residuum ultra predictos xx solidos, scilicet iiiiii solidos et iiiiii^{or} denarios retinuit ipse ad opus suum. Ideo predictus Dionisius in *misericordia* et satisfaciat predictis hominibus de predictis denariis, scilicet de una marca. Et *ad iudicium*.⁵⁸ de predicto Ricardo de Grey.

⁵⁶Margin note by scribe, mie' crossed out.

⁵⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵⁸Margin note by scribe, ad jud crossed out.

B313. It is determined by a jury that Denis de la Bocland, a bailiff, took 33 shillings and 4 pence from the men of the tithing of Aylesford instead of 20 shillings for which [amount] they were amerced before the justices itinerant. The jurors were asked to whose benefit he took the money. They said Denis paid Richard de Grey, his lord, 10 shillings and the remainder of the 20 shillings, namely 4 shillings and 4 pence he retained to his own benefit. So Denis [is] in mercy. He shall satisfy the men of the money, namely for one mark. To *judgement* with Richard de Grey.

B314.(T) Juratores presentant quod Willelmus de la Grene dum fuit ballivus Willelmi de Say apud Berling' fecit infra ⁱⁱⁱⁱ^{or} annos ^{xiiii}^{or} prepositos in predicto manerio de tenentibus ipsius Willelmi qui tenent in gavelikend' amovendo unumquemque post (aliumⁱ) et singulos reliquid in debitum erga plures de patria (de rebus quas ceperant ad opus domini suiⁱ), scilicet quendam Gilbertum le Wearme in x libris, Willelmum Hulot c solidis, Simonem Guce in ⁱⁱⁱⁱ^{or} libris, Radulfum Leverich' in c solidis Robertum le Cat in dimidia marca, Stephanum del Brok' in xxvi solidis, Henricum Lek' qui fuit propositus tantummodo per unum diem in vi solidis, Lambertum le Cayers de Wald' similiter per unicum diem ⁱⁱⁱⁱ^{or} solidos, Danielelem de Wad' in vi solidis, Adam de Haylefeld' qui fuit propositus per unicum diem in iii solidis, Nicholaum de la Dene in v solidis, Radulfum le Canun per unicum diem in i marca, Riacerdum del Brok' in xii solidis. Et alia vice ii marcis et tercio vi solidis, viii denariis, Adam del Brok' per unicum diem iii solidis. Et Willelmus venit et bene cognoscit quod tot propositos composuit et amovit, set dicit quod eos amovit ex precepto domini sui et quantum ipsi perceperant et mutaverant a patriotis ceperunt ad opus domini sui et non ad opus suum. Et juratores quesiti si tot propositus fecit et amovit infra tantum tempus ex precepto predicti Willelmi de Say domini sui aut ex propria malicia, dicunt quod propria malicia ipsius Willelmi de la Grene, set dicunt quod propositi totam predictam pecuniam perceperunt ad opus predicti Willelmi de Say domini sui. Ideo predictus Willelmus de la Grene committatur *gaole*.⁵⁹ Et dictum est vicecomiti quod faciat predictum Willelmum de Say venire die [blank]

Post venit predictus Willelmus de la Grene et finem fecit pro predictis transgressionibus per *xl solidis*. Et vicecomes capiet plegios.

B314.(T) The jurors present that William de la Green, while he was William de Say's bailiff at Birling, appointed 14 stewards within four years from William's tenants who held in gavelkind on the manor. He [then] removed one after the other and each remained in debt towards many countrymen for things which they had taken to the benefit of his lord, namely Gilbert le Wearme in 10 pounds, William Howletts [in] 100 shillings, Simon Guce in 4 pounds, Ralph Levericks in 100 shillings, Robert le Cat in a half mark, Stephen del Brook in 26 shillings, Lambert le Cayers of Weald [steward] for one day [in] 4 shillings, Danial of Wad in 6 shillings, Adam of Haylefield who was a steward for a day [in] 3 shillings, Nicholas de la Dean [in] 5 shillings, Ralph le Chavun [steward] for a day [in] 1 mark, Richard del Brook [in] 12 shillings and for other accounts 2 marks and a third of 6 shillings [and] 8 pence. William comes and readily acknowledges that he made them all stewards and removed them, but he says that he removed them at his lord's will and however much they had collected and borrowed from the countrymen they have taken it for the benefit of their lord and not his. The jurors were asked if he appointed and removed all the stewards within that time at William of Say's will or by his own ill-doing. The jurors said that at William de la Green's ill-doing, but they say that the stewards collected all the money for William of Say's benenfit. So William de la Green is to be committed to *gaol*. It is said to the sheriff that he make William of Say come on

Afterwards, William de la Green came and made fine for the transgressions for 40 shillings. The sheriff shall take the pledges.

B315. Thomas de Hoo ballivus in *miser cordia*⁶⁰ pro pluribus transgressionibus.

⁵⁹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁶⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B315. Thomas of Hoo a bailiff [is] in *mercy* for numerous transgressions.

[Printer Anomaly--see page 106]

B316.(Kant') Walterus de sancto Johanne queritur de Rogero de Leyburn' quod idem Rogerus die mercurii proxima ante festum sancti Andree proximo preterito cepit et capere fecit per quendam Walterum de Mere servientem eius et alios (in terra ipsius Walterii) in villa de Nessinden' quatuor equos ipsius Walteri pretii ^{iiii^{or}} marcarum et illos fugari fecit usque ad manerium suum de Leyburn' et eos ibidem detinuit. Et cum quidam Thomas de Hoo ballivus illius hundredo ad querelam ipsius Walteri venisset ad predictum manerium ad deliberacionem predictorum equorum faciendam, idem Rogerus dictos equos fugari fecit usque apud Langel' in hundredo de Eyhorn' extra aliud hundredum, et equos illos ibidem adhuc detinet contra vadium et plegium, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam x librarum. Et inde producit sectam.

Et Rogerus venit et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene cognoscit quod capere fecit predictos equos in predicta terra, quia dicit quod predictus Walterus tenetur ei in quinque marcis annuatim reddendis de eadem terra, ad duos terminos anni, scilicet medietatem [ad] festum sancti Michaelis et aliam medietatem ad Pascha. Et dicit quod quia ei aretro fuerunt ii marce et dimidia de termino Sancti Michaelis proximo preterito, ideo distrinxit ipse predictum Walterum per predictos equos pro predictis arreragiis. Et profert scriptum ipsius Walteri in quo continetur quod idem Walterus tenetur eidem Rogero et heredibus suis et assignatis in quinque marcis annuatim reddendis de predicta terra.

Et Walterus dicit quod revera ipse confecit eidem Rogero predictum scriptum, set dicit quod hoc fuit per compulsionem ipsius Rogeri et non mera voluntate sua. Dicit enim quod ipse aliquo tempore dimiserat eidem Rogero manerium suum de Nessinden' pro xii libris annuatim ei reddendis. Et dicit quod quia idem Rogerus detenuit ei predictam firmam, et non habuit potestatem distringendi ipsum Rogerum, nec etiam potuit justiciam habere de eo in curia (regia^s), ob favorem quem idem Rogerus habuit qui tunc temporis stetit cum Willelmo de Valencia fratrem domini regis, ideo confecit ipse predictum scriptum. Et Walterus quesitus qualiter compulsus etc.

Postea concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis scilicet, quod predictus Walterus recognoscit et concessit pro se et heredibus suis quod ipsi de cetero reddent singulis annis predicto Rogero et heredibus suis quinque marcas de predicto manerio et aliis terris et tenementis, scilicet medietatem ad festum sancti Michaelis et aliam medietatem ad Pascha. Ita quod si defecerit in solucione predicti redditus (ad aliquem terminum¹) licebit predicto Rogero etc. ipsos distringere in predictis tenementis usque ad plenam solucionem denariorum qui aretro fuerunt de illo termino. Et pro hac etc. predictus Rogerus remisit eidem Waltero ii marcas et dimidiam que ei prius aretro fuerit de termino sancti Michaelis de predicto redditu. Et preterea dat eidem Waltero C solidos de quibus ei solvet in continenti xx solidos et vi marcas ad mediam quadragesime anno xliii. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod viecomes faciat de terris etc. Et etiam restuet ei predictos ^{iiii^{or}} equos quos ceperat pro predictis arreragiis. Et similiter omnes contentiones inter ipsos omnibus modis (^{il}) hinc inde remittuntur etc.

B316.(Kent) Walter of Saint John complains against Roger de Leybourne that on the first Wednesday before the feast of Saint Andrew just passed [27 November 1258], Roger seized and caused to be seized, through Walter of Meres Court his serjeant and others, from Walter of Saint John's lands in the vill of Nashenden, four horses worth 4 marks. He drove them to his manor of Leybourne. There he detains them. When in response to Walter's complaint Thomas of Hoo, the bailiff of that hundred, came to the manor in order to free the horses, Roger drove the horses to Langley in the hundred of Eyhorne, outside the other hundred. He still detains the horses there against the pledge. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 10 pounds. Thereon he produces suit.

Roger comes and denys force and injury. He readily acknowledges that he had the horses taken from the land, since he says that Walter is held to him in five marks yearly rent for the land [which is to be paid] at two yearly installments, namely half at the feast of Saint Michael [September 29] and the other half at Easter. He says that since Walter was in arrears to him for two and a half marks for the last Michaelmas term, he distrained him through the horses for the arrears. He produced Walter's deed in which is contained the [fact] that for the land Walter is held to Roger and his heirs and assignees for five marks yearly rent.

Walter says that he made the deed with Roger, but he says that Roger forced him to and [this was] not done at his own will. He also says that he once demised Roger his manor of Nashenden for 12 pounds yearly rent. He says that since Roger withheld the farm from him and he did not have the power to distrain Roger, nor can he have justice concerning him in the king's court because of the favour which Roger had [as one] who stood with William de Valence, the king's brother, so he made the deed. Walter was questioned in what way he was forced [to make the deed].

Afterwards, they are agreed by licence. The agreement [is] as such; namely that Walter acknowledges and grants for himself and his heirs that, henceforward, they shall render five marks each year to Roger and his heirs for the manor and the other lands and tenements, namely half at the feast of Saint Michael [29 September] and the other half at Easter. Thus, if he defaults in payment of the rent at any term Roger can lawfully distrain them in the tenements until [he has] full payment of the money in which they were in arrears for that term. For this, Roger remits Walter the two and a half marks of which he was previously in arrears for the Michaelmas term. Moreover, he gives Walter 100 shillings of which he shall pay him in full 20 shillings and 6 marks in the middle of Lent year 43 [1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands. He also returns the 4 horses which he seized for the arrears. Likewise, all disputes previously held between them are ended.

B317. Walkelinus Thorel queritur de Willelmo de la Grene quod cum devenisset plegio eiusdem Willelmi versus personam de Padeleswurth' de uno quarterio frumenti; idem (soluti non soluti^S) predictum bladum ad terminum sibi prefixum. Ita quod ipse Walkelinus pro defectum ipsius Willelmi et per gravem distrincionem quam dictus persona fecit pro predicto debito, vendidit ipse dimidiam acram terre sue pro octo solidis quos soluit pro predicto blado, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xx solidorum.

Et juratores super quos predictus Willelmus posuit se inde hoc idem testantur et quod idem Walkelinus deterioratus est occasione predicta ad valenciam iiii^{Or} solidorum. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Willelmus satisfaciatur ei de predictis octo solidis, et similiter de predictis iiii^{Or} solidis pro dampnis suis. Et sit in *miserordia*¹ pro transgressione.

B317. Wakelin Torell complains against William de la Green that whereas he became William's pledge against the parson of Paddlesworth for one quarter of wheat, William did not pay the grain at the fixed term. Thus Wakelin, on account of William's default and through the great distraint made by the parson, sold half an acre of his land for eight shillings to pay for the grain. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 20 shillings.

The jurors upon whom William placed himself testify to this and that Wakelin suffered damage on the occasion to the value of 4 shillings. So it is adjudged that William shall satisfy him of the eight shillings and likewise for the damages of 4 shillings. He is in *mercy* for the transgression.

B318. Juratores presentant quod homines Willelmi de Monte Caniso de Adinton' subtraxerunt se de sectis faciendis ad hundredum istud a festo sancti Michaelis anno xli. Et super hoc venit ballivus predicti Willelmi de Monte Caniso et profert cartam H. regis avi per quam concessit cuidam Radulfo de Monte Caniso consanguineo ipsius Willelmi cuius heres ipse est, quod ipse et homines sui de Adinton' sint quieti de sectis comitatu et hundredo. Et quia testatum est quod homines predicti semper fecerunt predictam sectam usque ad predictum tempus quando Rogerus de Saccario tenuit predictum manerium. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

B318. The jurors present that William of Montchensey's men of Addington withdrew themselves from suit to this hundred from the feast of Saint Michael year 41 [29 September 1257]. Concerning the above, William of Montchensey's bailiff comes and produces a charter by King Henry, [the present king's] grandfather, by which he granted Ralph of Montchensey, William's relative by blood whose heir he is, that he and his men of Addington were quit regarding suit to the county and the hundred [courts]. Since it is testified that the men always

¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

made the aforesaid suit up to the time when Roger of the Exchequer held the manor, so *it is to be discussed*.

- B319. Willelmus filius Alexanderi de Preston' Archiepiscopi queritur de Henrico Lovell' quod cum idem Willelmus amerciatus esset ad i marcam pro quodam falso apellatione quod idem Willelmus fecit coram H. de Bath' et sociis suis et soluisset predictam marcam; predictus Henricus postea distrinxit ipsum pro xx solidis quos non debuit.

Et Henricus venit et bene cognoscit quod distrinxit ipsum pro xx^{ti} solidis et hoc per summonicionem de scaccario, unde dicit quod idem Willelmus alias implacitavit ipsum coram baronibus de scaccario de hoc quod injuste distrinxit ipsum pro predictis solidis. Et tunc convictum fuit coram eisdem baronibus quod injuste distrinxit ipsum. Et de hoc ponit se super rotulos de scaccario. Ideo datus est dies *ad parleamentum*. Et tunc querantur rotuli (scaccario^s).

- B319. William son of Alexander of Preston complains against Henry Lovel that since he [William] was amerced for 1 mark for a false appeal which he made before [Henry] de Bath and his colleagues, and he paid the mark, Henry [nonetheless] distrains him for 20 shillings which he does not owe.

Henry comes and readily acknowledges that he distrained him for the 20 shillings and this was by summons from the exchequer. Wherefore, he says that William, elsewhere, pleaded him before the barons of the exchequer concerning this, that he unjustly distrained him for the money. At that time it was determined before the barons that he unjustly distrained him. On this he places himself on the rolls of the exchequer. So a day is given them at the *parliament*. At that time the rolls of the exchequer are to be examined.

- B320.(T) Villate de Berling' et Burgham et pars Hundredi de Larkefeld' queruntur de Rogero de Leyburn' quod ubi ipsi habere solebant quoddam chiminum (in villa de Leyburn'ⁱ) eundi eques et pedes usque Malling', predictus Rogerus ibidem fieri fecit quoddam vivarium quominus habere possunt ibidem chiminum predictum ad nocumentum totius patrie etc.

Et Rogerus venit et bene cognoscit quod ipsi habere solebant ibidem quoddam chiminum, set dicit quod hoc fuit ex gracia antecessorum suorum, et dicit quod predictum chiminum nunquam fuit regale chiminum immo quedam semita ultra dominica manerii sui de Leyburn'. Et bene concedit quod permittet ipsos de cetero ibidem habere predictum chiminum sicut habere consueverunt. Ita quod ibidem fieri fecit quendam parvum pontem juxta predictum vivarium eundi eques et pedes sicut solebant et quod ipse et heredes sui pontem illum sustentabunt. Et predicti homines tenent se inde contentos. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat de cetero predictum Rogero ad sustentandum predictum pontem etc.

- B320.(T) The vills of Birling and Burham and parts of the hundred of Larkfield complain against Roger de Leybourne that whereas they were accustomed to have a way in the vill of Leybourne to come and go with horses and on foot as far as Malling, Roger built a stream there by which the less they are able to have the way to the nuisance of the entire country.

Roger comes and readily acknowledges that they were accustomed to have a way there, but he says that this was at his ancestors grace. He says the way was never a royal way, rather just a path across his manor of Leybourne. He readily grants that he will allow them, henceforward, to have a way there just as they have been accustomed to have. Thus, he shall make a small bridge across the stream to come and go with horses and men on foot just as they were accustomed. He and his heirs shall maintain the bridge. The men hold themselves content. So the sheriff is ordered that, henceforward, he shall distrain Roger to maintain the bridge.

- B321. Johanna filia Radulfi Ruffin queritur de Egidio de Grenherst quod detinet ei iiii^{or} marcas et dimidiam quas predictus Radulfus pater ipsius Johanne tradidit eidem Egidio ad maritandum ipsam. Et Egidius venit. Et concordati sunt. Et Egidius dat *dimidiam marcam*² pro licencia concordandi. Et est concordia talis, scilicet quod predicta Johanna remisit eidem Egidio

²Margin note by scribe, di. m. crossed out.

unam marcam de predicto debito. Et pro hac etc. preductus Egidius concessit quod reddet ei tres marcas et dimidiam ad duos terminos scilicet medietatem ad mediam Quadragesime (anno xliii¹) et aliam medietatem ad Pentecostem. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat etc.

- B321. Joan daughter of Ralph Ruffin complains against Giles of Greenhurst that he withheld 4 and a half marks from her, which [money] Ralph, Joan's father, had handed to Giles at her marriage. Giles comes. The are agreed by licence. Giles gives a *half mark* for a licence to agree. The agreement is as such; that Joan remits one mark of the debt to Giles. For this, Giles grants that he shall render three and a half marks to her at two terms, namely half in the middle of Lent year 43 [1259] and the other half at Pentecost [1 June 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

[Membrane 19]

Hundredum de Hoo.

The Hundred of Hoo.

- B322. Juratores presentant quod cum presentaciones fieri debeant ad unumquemque comitatum de morte hominum et aliorum infortuniorum accidentum in singulo hundredo Reginaldus de Cobham dum fuit vicecomes levavit quandam consuetudinem, scilicet quod nulla presentacio potuit ex audiri eorum eo antequam fecissent finem cum eo ne occasio arentur aliquando per dimidiam marcam aliquando i marcam, secundum maius et minus ad voluntatem suam. Que consuetudo adhuc servatur in comitatu isto. Et hoc idem presentantum est fere in quolibet hundredo. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

- B322. The jurors present that whereas presentments ought to be made at each county [court] concerning murder and other misadventures [which occurred] in each hundred, Reginald of Cobham, while he was sheriff, raised a custom, namely that no presentment of theirs could be heard before they made a fine with him, indeed on some occasions it is assessed at a half mark on other [occasions] at 1 mark, more or less according to his will. This custom is still observed in this county. This is presented in nearly every hundred. So *it is to be discussed*.

- B323. Thomas de Frechenested' in *misericordia*³ pro contemptu curie.

- B323. Thomas of Frinsted [is] in *mercy* for contempt of court.

- B324.(Larkef') Johannes de Estwude queritur de Roberto de Wulldham quod cum idem Robertus tenebatur L. Roffens' Episcopo domino suo in x libris solvendis infra quinque annos, scilicet quolibet anno xl solidos pro custodia terre et heredis cuiusdam Johannis le Vel quam Episcopus eidem Roberto dimiserat et assignasset ipsum Johannem percipere eosdem denarios de predicto Roberto et inde eum cartavit. Ita quod postea unde respondebat super compotum suum, predictus Robertus detinuit ei predictos denarios et illos ei reddere contradicit. Et similiter cum idem Robertus tenebatur eidem Episcopo in xii libris et vi solidis de debito in quo tenebatur Ricardo Episcopo Roffens' predecessori istius Episcopi et idem Johannes inde cartatus esset et unde respondebat super comptum suum; predictus Robertus detinet ei predictos denarios et illos reddere contradicit.

Et Robertus venit et quo ad predictas x libras bene defendit quod non tenetur predicto Episcopo in predicto debito ratione predictae custodie. Quia (dicit¹) quod revera convenit inter predictum Episcopum et ipsum quod predictus Episcopus ei concessisse debuit et carta sua confirmasse tenementum suum in Borstall' quod tenuit de predicto Episcopo tenendi illud per servicium militare, quod prius tenuit de eodem Episcopo in gavelikend'. Ita quod si idem Episcopus fecisset ei predictam concessionem, teneretur ei in predictis x libris et dicit quod quia predictus Episcopus non tenuit ei convencionem in hac parte, noluit ipse solvere

³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

predictos denarios. Et quo ad predictas xii libras et vi solidos dicit quod revera ipse aliquo tempore tenebatur predicto Ricardo quondam Episcopo Roffen' in predictis denariis, set dicit quod post mortem ipsius Episcopi seisivit B. Archiepiscopus Cantuar' Baroniam predicti Episcopi in manum suam et ipse eidem Archiepiscopo respondebat de eisdem xii libris et vi solidis.

Et Johannes dicit quod ratione predictae custodie quam predictus Episcopus dominus eius ei dimiserat tenebatur ipse in predictis x libris et non pro predicta convencionem. Dicit etiam quod predictas xii libras et vi solidos cognovit idem Robertus se debere predicto Episcopo domino suo coram H. de Bathon' et sociis suis justiciariis coram domino rege anno xxxviii postquam predictus Archiepiscopus reddidit eidem Episcopo Baroniam suam, et similiter cognovit se debere eidem Episcopo domino suo predictas x libras. Et de hoc ponit se super recordum rotulorum domini regis de anno predicto. Et Robertus similiter. Ideo Querantur Rotuli. Dies datus est eis in octabis Purificacionis beate Marie apud *Westmonasterium* et interim querantur rotuli.

B324.(Larkfield) John of Eastwood complains against Robert of Wouldham that whereas Robert is held to [Laurence] Bishop of Rochester, his lord, to pay 10 pounds within five years, namely 40 shillings each year, for custody of the land and heir of John le Vel, which [custody] the bishop had demised and assigned to Robert [and] John [ought] to collect the money from Robert and he gave him a charter. Thus, [when] he was answering concerning his account, Robert withheld the money from him and refused to render it. Likewise, whereas Robert was held to the bishop in 12 pounds and 6 shillings concerning a debt in which he was held to Richard Bishop of Rochester, this bishop's predecessor, and John was given a charter and thereafter [when] answering concerning his account Robert withheld the money from him and refused to render it.

Robert comes and as regards the 10 pounds he readily maintains that he is not held to the bishop in a debt by reason of the custody. He says that the agreement between the bishop and him [is as such] that the bishop ought to grant him, and his charter confirms, the tenement in Borstal which he holds of the bishop, to hold it by military service since he previously held it of the bishop in gavelkind. Thus, if the bishop made him that grant, he is held to the bishop in 10 pounds. He says that since the bishop has not held to the agreement in this part, he does not wish to pay the money. As regards the 12 pounds and 6 shillings, he says that he once was held to Richard, once Bishop of Rochester, but that after the bishop's death [Boniface] Archbishop of Canterbury seized the bishop's barony into his hand and he answered to the archbishop for the 12 pounds and 6 shillings.

John says that by reason of the custody which the bishop demised to Robert, he was held to him in 10 pounds and not by the agreement. He also says that after the archbishop had rendered the barony to the bishop, Robert acknowledged, before the king's court year 38 [1253-1254], that he owed the 12 pounds and 6 shillings to the bishop before [Henry] de Bath and his colleagues justices. Likewise, he acknowledged that he owed the bishop 10 pounds. On this he places himself on the king's rolls of the aforesaid year. Robert [does] likewise. So the rolls are to be examined. A day is given them in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] at *Westminster*. In the meantime the rolls are to be examined.

Hundredum de Toltenr'

The Hundred of Toltingtrough

B325.(Kant') Fulco de Sharsted' et Willelmus de Dudemere queruntur de Rogero de sancta Elena quondam ballivo de Mephram scilicet predictus Fulco quod cum ad ipsum pertinuit custodia terre et heredium Johannis de la Dene qui tenuit terram suam in gavelikend', ratione quod idem Fulco fuit propinquior predicto heredi ex parte matris, predictus Rogerus deforciat ei predictam custodiam quousque finem fecisset cum eo per quinque marcas quas ab eo extorsit et similiter cepit ab eo unum equum pretii xl solidorum de herietto. Et predictus Willelmus queritur quod idem Rogerus dum fuit ballivus de Mephram detuinit (ei¹) puturam suam per quinque annos quam percepisse debuit pro operacionibus suis quas fecerat ad manerium de Mephram, scilicet ad valenciam ii solidorum. Post venit predictus Rogerus et alii ballivi

Prioris sancte Trinitati Cantuar' et manuceperunt quod satisfacient ei de predictis ii solidis. Et quod de cetero solui facient eidem Willelmo predictam puturam suam. Et Willelmus tenet se inde contentum. Et predictus Fulco postea venit et dicit quod non vult sequi ulterius versus predictum Rogerum. Ideo ipse Rogerus inde sine die. Et Fulco in *misericordia*.⁴

B325.(Kent) Fulk of Sharstead and William of Dedmar complain against Roger of Saint Hellens, once bailiff of Meopham, that since Fulk had custody of the land and heir of John de la Dean, who held his land in gavelkind, by reason that Fulk was his nearest heir on the mother's side, Roger deforced him of the custody until he made fine with him for five marks which he extorted from him. Likewise, Roger took one horse worth 40 shillings from him for heriot. William complains that while Roger was bailiff of Meopham, he withheld his food allowance worth 2 shillings for five years, which [allowance] William ought to collect for his labours on the manor of Meopham. Afterwards, Roger and the other bailiffs of the prior of Saint Trinity of Canterbury come and pledge that they shall satisfy him of the 2 shillings. Henceforward, they shall pay William his food allowance. William holds himself content. Fulk comes and says that he does not wish to prosecute further against Roger. So Roger is without a day. Fulk [is] in *mercy*.

B326. Juratores presentant quod Willemus de Valencia qui habuit custodiam terrarum que fuerunt Warini de Monte Caniso post mortem ipsius Warini deforciat Dionisiam que fuit uxor eiusdem Warini dotem suam de manerio de Ludesdon' (per x et octo septimanas.¹) Et similiter deforciabit hucusque eidem Dionisie terciam partem catallorum ipsius Warini in predicto manerio ad valenciam C solidorum ipsam contingentem etc. [leaves off abruptly]

B326. The jurors present that William de Valence, who had custody of the lands which were Warin of Monchensey's after Warin's death, deforced Denise, who was Warin's wife, of her dower from the manor of Luddesdown for eighteen weeks. Likewise, to this point he has deforced Denise of a third part of Warin's chattels which befall her on the manor to the value of 100 shillings.

Hundredum de Twyferd'

The Hundred of Twyford

B327. Juratores presentant quod Dionisius de la Bokeland' dum fuit ballivus cepit de Gilberto de Henneherst unam marcā pro dimidia marca ad quam americiatus fuit coram eo in Hundredo suo ideo in *misericordia*.⁵ Et satisfaciat predicto Gilberto de dimidia marca si veniat. Item cepit de villata de Frendesbyr' vi solidos et de villata de Strode ii solidos et de Chalke ii solidos antequam voluit venire ad videndum quendam mortuum. Ideo in *misericordia*.

B327. The jurors present that Denis de la Bocland, while he was a bailiff, took one mark from Gilbert of Henghurst [whereas] he was [only] amerced at a half mark before him in his hundred. So he [is] in *mercy*. He shall satisfy Gilbert of the half mark, if he comes. He also took 6 shillings from the vill of Frindsbury, 2 shillings from the vill of Strood and 2 shillings from Chalk before he would come to view a certain dead body. So he [is] in *mercy*.

B328.(Eyhorn') Convictum est per juratam in quam Galfridus persona Ecclesie de Wycheling' se posuit quod idem Galfridus noctanter intravit in boscum Johannis de Fulmere in Wycheling' et plures arbores in eodem cepit et asportavit, et quandam Aliciam Petipas verberavit in domo sua et blada quorundam hominum Willelmi de Mares (metiit⁸) et asportavit et etiam bladum cuiusdam Florenti ad valenciam unius buselli avene et dimidie cepit et asportavit et uxorem eiusdem Florenti verberavit. Et similiter quendam Willelmum de Wulmere verberavit in domo sua propria et duas gallinas suas asportavit. Et etiam traxit quendam Walterum Gurnard parochianum suum in placitum in curie Christianitatis per litteras papales

⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

ad partes remotas et eum (etⁱ) plures alios sepius vexavit, ad maximum dampnum ipsorum. Et iuratores quesiti que dampna omnes predicti conquerentes haberunt per predictas injurias eis factas, dicunt quod ad valenciam xl solidorum. Ideo ipse Galfridus in misericordia. Et committatur *gaole*⁶ et satisfaciat eis de predictis xl solidis. Postea venit et reddidit eis predictos xl solidos pro dampnis suis. Et finis eius perdonatur per justiciarium.

B328.(Eyhorne) It is determined by the jury on which Geoffrey parson of the church of Wichling placed himself that Geoffrey, by night, entered John of Fowlmere's wood in Wichling and took numerous trees and carried them off and [that] he beat Alice Petipas in her own home and [that] reaped and carried off the grain of William of Mares' men. He also took and carried off Florence's grain worth one and a half bushels of oats and beat Florence's wife. Likewise, he beat William of Wulmere in his own home and carried off two hens. Through papal letters Geoffrey also pleaded Walter Gurnard, his parishoner, in court-Christian to remote parts and he harrassed Walter and many others to their great damage. The jurors were asked what damages all the complainants had as a result of the injuries he made; they say to the value of 40 shillings. So Geoffrey [is] in mercy. He is to be committed to *gaol*. He shall satisfy them of the 40 shillings. Afterwards, he came and rendered them the 40 shillings for his damages. His fine is pardoned by the justiciar.

Adhuc de Twyferd'.

Still Concerning Twyford.

B329. Homines Hamonis de Crevequor et Roberti de Barbling' de Borga de Elding' queruntur quod cum amerciamenta ad que villata de Elding' amerciari soleba(n^{ul})t coram quibuscumque levati semper consueverunt de tota predicta villa tam de hominibus et tenentibus de parte Comitis Glouc' in eadem villa quam de parte ipsorum Hamoni et Roberti, predicti homines ipsius Comitis iam duobus annis elapsis subtraxerunt se per ballivos eiusdem Comitis et nolunt respondere de porcione sua prout solebant. Ita quod ipsi pro defectum eorum distringuntur tota solucione predictorum amerciamentorum. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

B329. Hamo of Crevequer's [men] and Robert of Bramling's men, from the tithing of Yalding, complain that whereas the amercements for which the vill of Yalding was customarily amerced before whichever [justices] were always customarily raised from the whole vill, [namely] from the men and tenants from the earl of Gloucester's part as well as from Hamo and Robert' part; the earl's men, some two years ago, withdrew themselves through the earl's bailiffs and did not wish to answer for their portion as they were accustomed. Thus, through their default they were distrained for the whole payment. So *it is to be discussed*.

[Membrane 19d.]

Adhuc de Hundredo de Twyferd'

Still Concerning the Hundred of Twyford

B330. Prior de Ledes queritur de Bartholomeo Oteringbyr' quod cum ipsi teneant quoddam molendinum aquaticum in Oteringbyr' in communi, et ipsi simul percipere deberent proficium eiusdem molendini et simul sustentare illud ad custus utriusque, predictus Bartholomeus percipit medietatem totius commodi eiusdem molendini et nichil vult invenire ad sustentacionem illius, immo molas eiusdem nuper cepit et asportari fecit usque ad quoddam aliud molendinum ipsius Bartholomei in eadem villa ad maximum dampnum ipsius Prioris. Et similiter quendam mastinum eiusdem Prioris occidit et etiam caretas ipsius Prioris cariantes decimas suas in campis ipsius Bartholomei arrestari fecit et blada in predictis caretis existencia prostravit et cum caretis illis cariare fecit blada sua contra voluntatem

⁶Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

ipsius Prioris unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl solidorum etc.

Et Bartholomeus venit et bene defendit quod non asportari fecit predictas molas injuste, quia dicit quod (serviensⁱ) (molendinarius^{ul}) ipsius Prioris illas ei vendidit. Dicit etiam quod occidi fecit predictum mastinum eo quod invenit ipsum in dampno suo scilicet eo quod ceperat quendam Cunnigum in sua cunnigera. Et similiter bene cognoscit quod cariare fecit blada sua cum caretis ipsius Prioris, quia dicit quod serviens eiusdem Prioris accomadavit ei predictas caretas. Et de hoc ponit se super juratam. Et iuratores dicunt super sacramentum suum (quodⁱ) predictus Bartholomeus fecit eidem Priori omnes predictas transgressiones. Ideo consideratum est quod satisfaciat ei de dampnis suis que taxantur per justiciarium ad dimidiam marcam. Et sit in *misericordia*⁷ pro transgressione.

B330. The prior of Leeds complains against Bartholomew of Otterbury that whereas they hold a water mill in Otterbury in common and they both ought to collect the profits from the mill and likewise maintain it at both their costs, Bartholomew collects half of all the profits from the mill and does not wish to maintain it. Rather, he recently seized and carried off the millstones and took them to another of his mill's in the vill, to the prior's great loss. Likewise, he killed the prior's mastiff. He also seized the prior's carts carrying his tithes on Bartholomew's fields and the grain within the carts he emptied and with these carts he carted his grain, against the prior's will. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 40 shillings.

Bartholomew comes and readily maintains that he did not carry off the millstones, since he says that the prior's serjeant sold them to him. He also says that he killed the mastiff because he found it to his loss, namely because it seized a rabbit from his rabbit-warren. He readily acknowledges that he carted his grain with the prior's carts, since he says that the prior's serjeant lent him the carts. On this he places himself on the jury. The jurors say upon their oath that Bartholomew committed all the transgressions against the prior. So it is adjudged that he shall satisfy him of his damages which were assessed by the justiciar at a half mark. He is in *mercy* for the transgression.

Hundredum de Shamel'

The Hundred of Shamwell

B331. Juratores presentant quod Johannes de Cobbeham senior qui tenuit Hundredum istud ad feodi firmam de Magistro Militie Templi in Anglia adeo bene distrinxit homines habentes tenementa sine manso in predicto Hundredo, nec manentes in eodem, veniendi ad duos Lawedayes per annum, quam ipsos qui manentes fuerunt in predicto Hundredo. Et similiter iste Johannes junior postea. Ideo dictum est ei quod (nonⁱ) dstringat eos de cetero etc.

B331. The jurors present that John of Cobham senior, who held this hundred at farm-fee from the master of the Knights Templar in England, readily distrained the men having tenements in the hundred, without [their having had] a house [there] nor residing in the same [hundred], to come to the two lawdays per year, as well as [distraining] those who dwelled in the hundred. John junior [does] likewise, so it is said to him that henceforward he shall not distrain them.

B332.(Twyferd') Isabella de Pynnton' queritur de Willelmo de Tutesham quod idem Willelmus asportavit blada sua in terra sua (exisitencia^s) scilicet avenam et vesturam in una acra terre ipsius Isabelle. Et etiam fregit pertinencium ipsius Isabelle et quandam vaccam quam (ipsa^s) invenerat in dampno suo et ea occasione imparcaverat cepit et abduxit. Et Willelmus

Et Willelmus venit et dicit quod predicta acra terre de qua queritur quod ipse asportavit bladum suum non est terra sua, nec fuit eo tempore quo predictum bladum debuit asportari. Et similiter bene defendit quod nunquam fregit pertinentiam ipsius Isabelle nec predictam vaccam abduxit. Et de hoc ponit se super juratam.

Juratores dicunt quod predictus Willelmus non fecit predictae Isabelle predictas

⁷Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

transgressiones. Ideo ipse inde sine die. Et Isabella in *miser cordia*.⁸

B332.(Twyforyd) Isabel of Pointon complains against William of Tutsham that William carried off her crop existing on her land, namely the oats and corn on one acre. He also destroyed Isabel's appurtenances and he impounded and abducted one cow which he found at his loss.

William comes and says that the acre of land about which she complains that he carried off her crop is not her land, nor was it during the time when the crop ought to be carried off. Likewise, he readily maintains that he never destroyed Isabel's appurtenances, nor did he abduct the cow. On this he places himself on the jury.

The jurors say that William did not carry out the transgressions against Isabel. So he is without a day. Isabel [is] in *mercy*.

B333.(Shamel') Walterus le Bud queritur de Henrico le Breue, Stephano de Bedenesmers [et] Ricardo filio Margerie quod ipsi vi ceperunt duos boves suos et (i¹) vaccam pretii ii marcarum. Et ipsi non venerunt. Ideo veniant *die martis*.

B333.(Shamwell) Walter le Budds complains against Henry le Briwerr, Stephen of Bedenesmere [and] Richard son of Marjery that they forcefully took two oxen and one cow of his, worth 2 marks. They have not come. They shall come on *Tuesday*.
[Cross-references: ? B335, ? B374]

Hundredum de Chetham

The Hundred of Chatham

B334. Robertus de Wuldham in *miser cordia*⁹ pro injusta capcione dimidie marce quam cepit de Hundredo de Chetham antequam voluit permittere quendam mortuum sepeliri dum fuit ballivus in eodem hundredo.

B334. Robert of Wouldham [is] in *mercy* for the unjust seizure of a half mark, which he took from the hundred of Chatham, while he was its bailiff, before he would allow a certain body to be buried.

B335.(Shamel', T) Walterus But queritur de Henrico de Brewe, (Galfrido de Fraximo et Willelmo Germeyn^{ul}) quod (ipsi^s) injuste (fregerunt^s) attilium caruce sue in villa de Trovesclyve et (ceperunt^s) quendam bovem suum et quandam vaccam pretii xii solidorum et illos adhuc (detinent^s) etc. Et Henricus venit et bene cognoscit quod cepit predicta averia quia dicit quod ipsi (perⁱ) preceptum ballivorum domini Archiepiscopi et per summonicionem scaccarii et per (preceptum^{ul}) et extractas senescalli predicti Archiepiscopi distrinxit ipse predictum Walterum pro una marca ad quam villa (de Trottecliveⁱ) amerciata fuit coram justiciariis. Set quod attilium Caruce sue non (fregerunt^s) et nec aliam transgressionem ei (fecerunt^s) (ponunt^s) se super juratam.

Juratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod revera predictus Henricus simul cum aliis per preceptum ballivorum Archiepiscopi distrinxit predictum Walterum pro debito domini regis et summonitio que venit de scaccario, sed dicunt quod idem Henricus et quamplures alii cum eo ibidem venerunt vi et armis pro predicta districcione facienda et non debito modo prout decet ballivum domini regis venire ad districciones faciendas. Et ideo predictus Henricus committatur *gaole*¹⁰ et sit in *miser cordia* pro transgressionem. Et super hoc venit Rogerus de Northwud' senescallus Archiepiscopi et petit ipsum liberari ad prisonam domini sui, et dicit quod hucusque usus est idem Archiepiscopus et predecessores sui similiter uti sunt habere homines suos et singulos arrestatos de feodo suis coram quibuscumque

⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁰Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

justiciariis. Et quia attornatus R. le Bygod Comitis Noff' et Marescalli Anglie ratione mareschacie calumpniat libertatem habendi in custodia sua singulos arrestatos coram Capitale justiciario adeo bene sicut coram domino Rege. Ideo predictus Henricus remaneat cum predicto justiciario in custodia ut in equa manu quousque discusciatur inter eos etc. Postea de consensu predicti Comitis mariscalli liberatus fuit predictus Henricus----- predicto Archiepiscopo custodiendus simul cum aliis arrestatis et personibus de feodo eiusdem Archiepiscopi usque a die Purificacionis beate Marie in xv dies ubicumque etc. Ita quod nichil juris interim acrescat ipsi Archiepiscopo in hac parte occasione predictae custodie; nec aliquid depereat predicto Comite Mariscallo. Et quod tunc sint coram domino Rege etc. recepturi inde quod justum fuerit etc.

B335.(Shamwell, T) Walter Budds complains against Henry [le] Briwerr that he destroyed his plough equipment in the vill of Trottscliffe and he seized his ox and cow, worth 12 shillings. He still witholds them. Henry comes and readily acknowledges that he took the beasts. He says that on the order of the bailiffs of the archbishop and by summons from the exchequer and by an estreat from the archbishop's seneschal he distrained Walter for one mark, for which the vill of Trottscliffe was amerced before the justices. But, [he says] he did not destroy his plough equipment nor did he carry out any transgression against him. On this he places himself on the jury.

The jurors say upon their oath that Henry, along with the others on the order of the archbishop's bailiffs, distrained Walter for the king's debt and by the summons which came from the exchequer. But, they say that Henry and however many others came with him to make the distraint [came] there with force of arms and not in the manner [in which] a king's bailiff ought to come to make distraints. So Henry is to be committed to *gaol*. He [is] in mercy for the transgression. Concerning the above, Roger of Northwood the seneschal of the archbishop comes and requests that Henry be freed to his lord's prison. He says that to this point the custom is that the archbishop and his predecessors were accustomed to have their men and those arrested from their fee, before whichever justices, [freed to them]. Since the attorney for [Roger] Bigod Earl of Norfolk and Marshal of England, by reason of the marshalship, claims to have the liberty of custody of those arrested before the chief justice as well as [those arrested] before the king, so Henry shall remain with justiciar in equal custody until it is discussed between them. Afterwards, on the earl marshal's agreement Henry was freed----- to the archbishop's custody along with the other arrestees and persons from the archbishop's fee, until 15 days from the Purification of the Blessed Mary [16 February]. In the meantime, as regards the custody, the archbishop's right shall not increase nor shall the earl Marshal's right decrease. Then they shall be before the king to receive what will be just. [Cross-references: ? B333, ? B374]

Hundredum de Maydenstan

The Hundred of Maidstone

B336. Hamo Gest queritur de Simone de Essex' et Willelmo le Carett' quod ipsi insultum fecerunt in ipsum et eum verberaverunt, wlnraverunt et predictus Simo percussit ipsum quodam cultello per medietatem manus sinistre. Ita quod manus per ictum illum fere putrestam est et iam amisit quendam digitum predictae manus. Et ipsi nec venerunt. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eos venire *die Mercurii* etc.

B336. Hamo Gest complains against Simon of Essex and William le Carter that they insulted, beat and wounded him and [that] Simon struck him across the middle of his left hand with a knife. As a result of that wound the hand is rotting and thus he lost a finger from that hand. They have not come. So the sheriff is ordered to make them come on *Wednesday*.

B337. Convictum est per juratam in quam Aluredus de Dene se posuit quod idem Aluredus (cepit^{ul}) dum fuit subvicecomes cepit de quodam Gilberto filio Osberti de Kemesl' (utlagatoⁱ) qui occidit Stephanum de Lindes' xx solidos per sic quod permetteret ipsum moram facere in patria post factum illud ad subtraendum catalla sua. Ideo ipse in

misericordia.¹¹ Et respondeat domino rege de predictis *xx solidis*.¹²

B337. It is determined by the jury on which Alfred of Dean placed himself that Alfred, while he was sub-sheriff, took 20 shillings from Gilbert son of Osbert of Kemsley, an outlaw, who killed Stephen of Lindeseye, on condition that he allow him to remain in the country after the fact, [so that] he could remove his chattels. So he [is] in *mercy*. He shall answer to the king for the 20 *shillings*.

B338. Hugo de Unenhull' queritur de Ricardo de Sharsted' quondam ballivo Archiepiscopi de Maydestan quod idem Ricardus anno xxxvii cepit ipsum in villa de Unenhull' et duxit apud Maydestan et ibidem ipsum inprisonavit in priona predicti Archiepiscopi et extorsit ab eo *xx solidos*.

Et Ricardus venit et bene cognoscit quod inprisonavit ipsum in predicta priona domini sui. Quia dicit quod predictus Hugo indictatus fuit per quendam probatorem Eustachium Vigrus nomine qui ipsum appellavit de societate latrocinii et ea ratione capit ipsum et inprisonavit modo predicto. Dicit etiam quod revera ipse cepit finem *xx solidorum* de eo pro liberationem [a] priona habenda ad opus domini sui Archiepiscopi et non ad opus suum proprium. Et juratores hoc idem testantur. Ideo Ricardus inde quietus et Hugo in *misericordia*¹³ per plegium Johannis de Gillingham et Nicholai de Boxel'.

B338. Hugh of Underhill complains against Richard of Sharstead, once the archbishop's bailiff of Maidstone, that Richard during the year 37 [1252-1253] seized him in the vill of Underhill and led him to Maidstone. There he imprisoned him in the archbishop's prison and extorted 20 shillings from him.

Richard comes and readily acknowledges that he imprisoned him in the prison. He says that Hugh was indicted by Eustace Vigrus an approver, who appealed him for keeping the company of thieves. For that reason, he seized him and imprisoned him in the manner stated. He also says that he took the 20 shillings fine from him to free him from prison. This was for the archbishop's benefit and not his own. The jurors testify to this. So Richard is quit. Hugh [is] in *mercy* by pledge of John of Gillingham and Nicholas of Boxley.

B339. Convictum est per juratam in quam Rogerus de sancta Elena se posuit quod idem Rogerus dum fuit ballivus de Farleg' eiecit Dionisiam de Delton' extra francum bancum suum de quinque acris terre cum pertinentiis in Farleg' et illud detenuit per tres annos, et similiter (eadem queritur quod¹) extorsit ab ea quinque summas frumenti pretii *xxv solidorum*, duas summas avene pretii *vi solidorum* et duas vaccas pretii *xvi solidorum* et sex bidentes pretii *trium solidorum*. Et juratores quesiti que dampna predicta Dionisia habuit occasione predictae eiectionis (et extorcionis¹), dicunt quod ad valenciam *xl solidorum*. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus Rogerus satisfaciat ei de *xl solidis* per plegium Fulconis Peyforer. Et sit in *misericordia*¹⁴ pro transgressione.

B339. It is determined by the jury on which Roger of Saint Hellens placed himself that Roger, while he was the bailiff of Farleigh, ejected Denise of Delton from her free bench of five acres of land in Farleigh. He detained it from her for three years. Likewise, she complains that he extorted from her five measures of wheat worth 25 shillings, two measures of oats worth 6 shillings, two cows worth 16 shillings and six sheep worth three shillings. The jurors were asked what damages Denise had on the occasion of the ejections and extortions; they say [she suffered damage] to the value of 40 shillings. So it is adjudged that Roger shall satisfy her of the 40 shillings, by pledge of Fulk Payforer. Roger [is] in *mercy* for the transgression.

[Membrane 20]

¹¹Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

¹²Margin note by scribe, *xx. s.* crossed out.

¹³Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

¹⁴Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

Adhuc De Querelis

Still Concerning Complaints

B340.(Kant', T) Ricardus de Sling' queritur de Quintino de Wynton' clerico quod cum ipse dudum esset prepositus R. de Clare Comitis Glouc' et Heref' de manerio suo de Ealding' et aretro esset in compoto suo de quadam suuma pecunie ob quod jussus fuit arestari quousque securitatem inveniret de predicta pecunia reddenda, predictus Quintinus tunc ballivus predicti Comitis fecit ipsum incarcerari et ita affligi et torqueri in carcere quod neccessitate compulsus fecit ei quandam cartam de feoffamento de decem acris terre cum pertinenciis quas tenuit in Pecham. Et postmodum quia ipse implacitavit predictum Quintinum de predicta terra coram R. de Thurkelby et sociis suis apud Westmonasterium fecit idem Quintinus ipsum Ricardum capi apud Lond' per falsum suggestionem et inprisonari in priona de Newgate et ibidem detineri circiter per unum annum eo quod suggesit ballivis Civitatis Lond' quod predictus Ricardus conbusserat quandam domum ipsius Quintini et de hoc rettatus fuit per indictamentum patrie. Et dicit quod predictus Quintinus per predictum feoffamentum in priona predicta factum. Et modo quo predictum est detinuit iam decem annis elapsis predictam terram unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl librarum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et Quintinus venit et deffendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene deffendit quod nullam injuriam fecit predicto Ricardo set vult cognoscere quandam veritatem, quia dicit quod revera predictus Ricardus aliquo tempore fuit prepositus predicti Comitis de Aldinge' et ad compotum suum fuit in arreragiis de xxviii^{lo} libris. Ita quod arestatus fuit per senescallos predicti Comitis et inprisonatus in castro de Tonebrigg'. Et postmodum invenit ipse quosdam plegios de predicta pecunia reddenda scilicet totam curiam predicti Comitis de Aldinge' tali condicione quod nisi predictus Ricardus ad quendam certum terminum redderet predictam pecuniam, predicti plegii illam pro eo redderent. Et predictus Ricardus redderet se in prisonam predictam moraturus ibidem quousque satisfaceret eisdem plegiis de pecunia quam pro eo reddidissent. Et dicit quod predicti plegii postmodum reddiderunt pro eo predictam pecuniam eo quod ipse nichil habuit unde predictam pecuniam reddere potuit, ita quod predictus Ricardus neccessitate compulsus adivit ipsum Quintinum et exposuit ei predictam terram venalem et ipsam vendidit ei pro xii^{cim} marcis quas soluit predictis plegiis pro predicto Ricardo de quibus iidem plegii tenuerunt se contentos pro omnibus arreragiis predictis que prius solverant. Dicit etiam quod predictus Ricardus postea in plena curia fecit legi predictam cartam et eam cognovit et concessit. Et quod ad predictum inprisonamentum de Newgate bene deffendit quo per ipsum non fuit inprisonatus nec per aliquam suggestionem suam. Dicit enim quod revera quedam domus ipsius Quintinis conbusta fuit per quosdam malefactores. Ita quod predictus Comes dominus suus ad instanciam suam perquisivit quoddam breve domini Regis ut vicecomiti Kant' inquireret de predicta combustione. Ita quod vicecomes per inquisitionem coram eo captam invenit quod predictus Ricardus culpabiles fuit de predicta combustione. Et dicit quod idem Ricardus subtraxit se et postmodum inventus fuit apud London' et ibidem captus et inprisonatus in priona de Newgate. Et quod ita sit ponit se super patriam. Et Ricardus similiter. Ideo fiat inde jurata. Et juratores de consensu parcium electi dicunt super sacramentum suum quod re vera predictus Ricardus aliquo tempore fuit prepositus predicti Comitis de Aldinge' et fuit in arreragiis ad compotum suum de xxviii^{lo} libris. Ita quod per compotatores jussus fuit arestari et inprisonari in priona predicti Comitis apud Tonebreg' quousque securitatem inveniret de predicta pecunia reddenda. Et cum predictus Ricardus inprisonatus esset in priona predicta, predictus Quintinus qui tunc fuit ballivus predicti Comitis in tantum fecit ipsum dstringi et affligi in carcere pro predicta terra emenda quod predictus Ricardus neccessitate compulsus feoffavit ipsum de predicta terra et fecit ei quandam cartam de feoffamento. Et postea predictus Quintinus fecit ipsum adduci circiter per xxiii homines ad curiam predicti Comitis de Pecham et fecit predictum Ricardum ratificare et concedere predictam cartam et predictum feofamentum in plena curia. Quesiti utrum predictus Ricardus ratificavit predictam cartam per vim predicti Quintinis, vel per moram et bonam voluntatem ipsius Ricardi, dicunt quod hoc fuit per vim et distriktionem ut intelligunt. Quia dicunt quod nisi ratificaret predictum feofamentum in predicta curia,

predictus Ricardus reduceretur ad prisonam. Et quo ad predictum (inⁱ) prisonamen(tumⁱ) de Newgate dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Ricardus nunquam indictatus fuit de predicta combustione per aliquam inquisitionem. Set dicunt quod postquam predictus Ricardus inplacitavit predictum Quintinum de predicta terra coram justiciariis domini Regis apud Westmonasterium per breve de ingressu predictus Quintinus ira commotus versus ipsum tantum fecit versus ballivos Civitatis Lond' quod predictus Ricardus ibi fuit arestatus et detentus in predicta prisa de Newgate per magnum tempus. Ideo predictus Quintinus committatur *gaole*.¹⁵ Et satisfaciat predicto Ricardo de dampnis suis que taxantur ad [blank]. Et misericordia remmittitur quia pauper [est].

Post venit predictus Quintinus et sponte sua reddidit predicto Ricardo predictas decem acras terre et eas remisit et quietumclamavit de se et heredibus suis etc. Et pro hac etc. predictus Ricardus remittit ei dampna etc.

B340.(Kent, T) Richard of Sling complains against Quintin of Winchester a clerk that whereas [Richard] was recently the steward of [Richard] de Clare Earl of Gloucester and Hereford for his manor of Yalding and was in arrears in his account for a certain sum of money, for which he was rightly arrested until he found security for the money, Quintin, then the earl's bailiff, imprisoned him and tortured him in gaol so that he was forced out of necessity to make a charter of enfeoffment for ten acres of land which he held in Peckham. Afterwards, since he pleaded Quintin for the land before [Roger] de Thirkelby and his colleagues at Westminster, Quintin [caused] him to go to London by false suggestion. There Quintin [had] him imprisoned in the prison of Newgate and detained him for nearly a year, because he told the bailiffs of the City of London that Richard had burnt Quintin's home and for this he was accused by indictment of the country. He says that Quintin as a result of the aforesaid enfeoffment having been made in prison held the land for some ten years. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 40 pounds. Thereon he produces suit.

Quintin comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that he made no injury to Richard, but he wishes to know the truth. He says that Richard was once the earl's steward of Yalding and was in arrears in his account for 28 pounds. Thus, he was arrested by the earl's seneschals and imprisoned in the castle of Tonbridge. Afterwards, he found certain pledges to render the money, namely the whole of the earl's court of Yalding on the condition that unless Richard rendered the money by a certain set term the pledges would render it for him. Richard returned to prison, staying there until he had satisfied the pledges of the money which they were to render for him. He says that the pledges afterwards rendered the money for him, because he had no money to render. Thus Richard was forced out of necessity to approach Quintin and offer him [some] saleable land, and he sold the land to him for 12 marks which Quintin paid to the pledges on Richard's behalf, for which the pledges held themselves content for all the arrears. He also says that Richard afterwards in full court, lawfully made the charter and acknowledged and granted it. As regards the imprisonment at Newgate, he readily maintains that he was not imprisoned by him nor at his suggestion. In fact, he says that his house was burnt by certain ill-doers. Thus, at the instance of the earl, his lord, he obtained a royal writ so that the sheriff of Kent might inquire into the fire. Thus, the sheriff, by the inquiry taken before him, found that Richard was guilty of the fire. He says that Richard fled and was found at London and there he was taken and imprisoned at Newgate. On this he places himself on the country. Richard [does] likewise. So let there be a jury trial thereon. The jurors elected by both parties say upon their oath that Richard was once the earl's steward of Yalding and was in arrears to his account for 28 pounds. Thus, through the auditors he was properly arrested and imprisoned in the earl's prison at Tonbridge until he found security to render the money. When Richard was imprisoned, Quintin, who was then the earl's bailiff, so distrained and injured Richard in gaol for the land that he was forced out of necessity to enfeoff him of the land and he made a charter of enfeoffment to him. Afterwards, Quintin made him bring nearly 12 men to the earl's court of Peckham and in full court he made Richard ratify and grant the charter and the enfeoffment. [The jurors] were asked whether Richard ratified the charter as a result of Quintin's force or at his own pleasure and good will; as they understood it was by force and compulsion. They said that unless he

¹⁵Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

ratified the enfeoffment in court, Richard would return to prison. As regards the imprisonment at Newgate, they say upon their oath that Richard was never indicted by any inquiry for the fire. But, they say that after Richard pleaded Quintin for the land before the king's justices at Westminster, by writ of entry, Quintin became angry with Richard. Quintin [then] persuaded the bailiffs of the City of London that Richard should be arrested and detained in Newgate prison for a long time. So Quintin is to be committed to *gaol*. He shall satisfy Richard for his damages which are assessed at . His amercement is remitted since he [is] poor.

Afterwards, Quintin came and freely rendered the ten acres of land to Richard and he remitted and quitclaimed himself and his heirs. For this, Richard remitted his damages. [Cross-reference: B345]

- B341. Magister Rogerus de Cantuar' queritur de Waltero de Gosehal' quod cum ipse nuper vendidisset quibusdam Thome de Doveria et Radulfo de Stauntone blada sua de Sutton' et Yvereschirch' pro quarter viginti (et decemⁱ) marcis unde ei reddidisse debuerunt quinquaginta marcas ad festum sancti Johannis Baptiste anno xliii, et quadraginta marcas ad festum sancti Michaelis proximo sequens et ad solucionem illam predictis terminis faciendam invenirent ei predictum Walterum in plegium qui concessit quod nisi predicti Thomas et Radulfus redderent ei predictam pecuniam ad predictos terminos, predictus Walterus ex tunc tamquam capitalis debitor in solidum teneretur ei in predicto debito. Et scriptum suum ei inde faceret quod profert et quod hoc testatur. Et cum predicti Thomas et Radulfus non reddidissent eidem Magistero Rogero predictam pecuniam ad predictos terminos, predictus Walterus semper postea detinuit ei predictam pecuniam, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl librarum. Et inde producit sectam.

Et Walterus de Godeshal' venit et deffendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene cognoscit predictum scriptum et quicquid continetur in eo. Et bene cognoscit et concedit quod tenetur predicto Magistero Rogero in solucione predicti debiti nisi ita sit quod predicti Thomas et Radulfus soluerint ei predictam pecuniam ad predictos terminos. Set dicit quod bene credit quod predicti Thomas et Radulfus soluerunt ei predictam pecuniam. Et ideo datus est eis dies in crastino Purificacionis Beate Marie apud Westmonasterium ut tunc sciatur utrum predicti Radulfus et Thomas reddiderunt predicto Magistero Rogero predictam pecuniam nec ne. Et preceptum (estⁱ) vicecomiti Herteford' ubi predictus Radulfus manet quod tunc venire faciat predictum Radulfum. Et quia testatum est quod Thomas manet apud Doveriam mandatum est Ricardo de Grey Constabulario Doverie et Custodi Quinque portum quod faciat venire predictum Thomam die Jovis.

Postea concordati sunt per licenciam. Et est concordia talis quod predictus Walterus cognovit se teneri predicto Magistero Rogero in predicto debito et quod reddet ei inde triginta marcas ad Pascha anno xliii. Et triginta marcas ad festum sancti Michaelis proximo sequens. Et triginta marcas ad Purificacionem beate Marie anno xliiii. Et nisi fecerit; concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et preterea predictus Walterus hos invenit fidemssores scilicet Johannem de Sandwz, Radulfum Haket (etⁱ) Henricum Malemayns qui presentes sunt et cognoscunt se esse plegios predicti Walteri et concedunt quod reddent predicto Magistero Rogero predictam pecuniam ad predictos terminos si contingat predictum Walterum in solucione predictae pecunie deficere. Et nisi fecerunt, concedunt quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et pro hac etc. predictus Magister Rogerus remittit ei dampna etc.

- B341. Master Roger of Canterbury complains against Walter of Gadshill that whereas he recently sold his grain from Sutton and Ivychurch to Thomas of Dover and Ralph of Standen for ninety marks, for which they ought to render him fifty marks at the feast of Saint John the Baptist year 43 [24 June 1259] and forty marks at the following feast of Saint Michael [29 September] and to pay this amount at these terms they found Walter as a pledge and he acknowledged that unless Thomas and Ralph rendered the money at the terms, then he, as chief debtor in money, is held to him in debt. He granted him a deed, which he produced and which testifies to this. Whereas, Thomas and Ralph have not rendered the money to Master Roger at the terms Walter has always afterwards withheld the money. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 40 pounds. Thereon he produces suit.

Walter of Gadshill comes and denys force and injury. He readily acknowledges the deed and whatever is contained therein. He readily acknowledges and grants that he is held to pay

Master Roger the debt unless Thomas and Ralph pay him the money at the terms, but he truly believes that Thomas and Ralph paid him the money. So a day is given them on the morrow of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [3 February] at Westminster to determine whether Ralph and Thomas rendered Master Roger the money or not. So the sheriff of Herefordshire, where Ralph resides, is ordered to make Ralph come. Since it is testified that Thomas resides at Dover, Richard de Grey, Constable of Dover and the Cinque Ports, is ordered to make Thomas come on Thursday.

Afterwards, they are agreed by licence. The agreement [is] as such, that Walter acknowledges himself to be held to Master Roger for the debt and that he shall render thirty marks to him at Easter year 43 [13 April 1259], thirty marks at the feast of Saint Michael [29 September] and thirty marks at the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 44 [2 February 1260]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands. Afterwards, Walter found these suretors, namely John of Sandwich, Ralph Haket and Henry Malesmains, who are present and acknowledge themselves to be Walter's pledges. They grant that they shall render the money to Master Roger at the terms if Walter happens to default in payment of the money. If they do not, they grant that the sheriff may levy the amount from their lands. For this, Master Roger remits his damages.

B342. Christiana Bonet que fuit uxor Johannis Aurifabri filii Reginaldi Neel de Cantuar' cognovit quod remisit et quietumclamavit de se inperpetuum Henrico de Chelmerford' nuncio domini Regis et Gunnore uxori eius totum jus quod habuit vel habere potuit nomine dotis in quodam mesuagium cum curtilagio et omnibus pertinentiis suis in parochia beate Marie de Northgate quod jacet inter mesuagium quod quondam fuit Radulfi aurifabri versus orientem, et mesuagium Johannis le Brewere versus occidentem. Cognovit etiam quod remisit et quietumclamavit de se inperpetuum totum jus et clameum quod habuit vel habere potuit nomine dotis omnibus terris quas predictus Johannes Aurifaber eisdem vendidit sicut----carta inter eos inde confacta plenius testatur etc.

B342. Christiana Bonet who was the wife of John Goldsmith son of Reginald Neel of Canterbury acknowledges that she has remitted and quitclaimed herself in perpetuity to Henry of Chelmsford, the king's notary, and Gunnora his wife of all right which Christiana had or is able to have in the name of dower in a certain messuage with garden and appurtenances in the parish of the Blessed Mary of Newgate, which [messuage] lies between the messuage which was Ralph Goldsmith's towards the East and John le Briwerr's messuage towards the West. She also acknowledges that she has remitted and quitclaimed herself in perpetuity of all right and claim which she had or is able to have in the name of dower in all the lands which John Goldsmith sold them ----- as the charter drafted between them fully states.

B343. Alanus de Quervestede in *miser cordia*¹⁶ pro falso clamore versus Aluredum de Dene etc.

B343. Alan of Quervested [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Alfred of Dean.

B344.(Kant') Thomas de Hegham, Bartholomeus, Johannes et Robertus fratres ipsius Thome ponunt loco suo Robertum de Linsted' vel Johannem de Ponte Edelun versus Willelmum le Breton' de placito transgressionis.

B344.(Kent) Thomas of Higham, Bartholomew, John and Robert, Thomas' brothers, appoint as their attorneys Robert of Lynsted or John of Ponteland against William le Breton concerning a plea of trespass.

[Cross-references: B287, B428]

B345. Plegii Quintini de Winton', Ricardus de Henherst, Willelmus de Tutesham, Aunselmus de Braungbyr', Rogerus Snotben' Rogerus de Kant' et Willelmus de Lodeneford' qui manuceperunt habendi eum coram iusticiario de die in diem.

¹⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B345. The pledges of Quintin of Winchester [are] Richard of Henghurst, William of Tutsham, Anselm of Bradenbury, Roger Snodbeam, Roger of Kent and William of Longford who undertake to have him before the justiciar from day to day.
[Cross-reference: B340]

[Membrane 20d.]

B346.(Sebrightindene) Juratores presentant quod ballivi Archiepiscopi Cantuar' iam vii annis elapsis subtraxerunt tenentes de feodo predicti Archiepiscopi de secta facienda ad hundredum domini Regis de Sebrightindene quam semper usque tunc facere consueverunt. Et attornati predicti Archiepiscopi presentes sunt [leaves off abruptly]

B346.(Selbritten) The jurors present that the bailiffs of the archbishop of Canterbury, some 7 years ago, withdrew the tenants from the archbishop's fee from suit making to the king's hundred of Selbritten, which [suit] they were always accustomed to make. The archbishop's attorneys are present

B347.(Suff') Thomas filius Aucheri et Anabilia uxor eius cognoverunt quod concesserunt Johanni Weylond' manerium de Westreud' cum pertinenciis suis ad feodi firmam quod idem Johannes de eis prius tenuit ut in capitalibus mesuagiis, dominicis, feodis militum, homagiis, redditibus et serviciis liberorum hominum, villenagiis, boscis, pratis, pasturis, wardis, relevis et escaetis et omnibus aliis rebus ad predictum manerium pertinentibus, scilicet quicquid habuerunt vel habere potuerunt in Comitatu Suff' sine ullo retenemento habenda et tenenda eidem Johanni et heredibus suis vel suis assignatis et eorum heredibus de capitalibus dominis feodi illius libere in feodo et hereditate imperpetuum faciendo eisdem capitalibus dominis homagia et omnia servicia que ad manerium illud pertinent. Et reddendo inde per annum predictis Thome et Anabilie et heredibus ipsius Anabilie nomine feodi firme centum solidos sterligorum ad duos terminos in Prioratu sancte Trinitatis Lond' coram Sacrista vel Celerario eiusdem Prioratus qui pro tempore fuerunt scilicet medietatem ad mediam xL^am. Et alteram medietatem ad festum sancte Margarete virginis pro omnibus rebus que predicti Thomas et Anabilia et heredes ipsius Anabilie potuerunt clamare vel exigere in predicto manerio vel eius pertinenciis sive in dominico sive in Custodia, relevio, auxilio vel aliquo alio servicio imperpetuum. Et predicti Thomas et Anabilia et heredes ipsius Anabilie warrantizant predictis Johanni et heredibus suis vel suis assignatis et eorum heredibus predictum manerium cum omnibus pertinenciis suis per predicta servicia capitalibus dominis feodi illius facienda et per predictam firmam predictis Thome et Anabile sicut predictum est contra omnes homines imperpetuum sicut carta quam predictus Johannes (inde¹) habet de predictis Thome et Anabilie plenius testatur etc. Et concedunt quod secundum formam istam fiat inde in curia regis cyrographum inter eos.

B347.(Suffolk) Thomas son of Aucher and Anabel his wife have acknowledged that they have granted to John Weylond the manor of Westerfield, with all its appurtenances at farm-fee which [tenement] John previously held of them including: chief-messauges, demesne, knights-fees, homages, rents and the services of free men, villeins, woods, meadows, pastures, wards, reliefs and escheats and all other things which pertain to the manor, namely whatever they have or are able to have in the county of Suffolk without any reserve, for John and his heirs or assignees and their heirs to have and to hold from the chief lords of that fee freely in fee and in inheritance in perpetuity [and] to carry out [thereafter] to the chief lords homage and all other service which pertains to that manor. At the Priory of Saint Trinity London before the sacristan or the cellarer of the priory, John shall render as a farm-fee one hundred shillings in sterling per year to Thomas and Anabel and Anabel's heirs at two terms, namely half in the middle of Lent and the other half at the feast of Saint Margeret the Virgin [20 July]. [This sum is] for all things which Thomas and Anabel and Anabel's heirs are able to claim or collect in the manor or its appurtenances whether in demesne, custody, relief, auxiliary or any other service, in perpetuity. Thomas and Anabel and Anabel's heirs in perpetuity shall warrant John and his heirs or his assignees and their heirs concerning the manor and all its appurtenances for the service [owed] to the chief lords of that fee and for the

farm [owed] to Thomas and Anabel, just as the charter which John has from Thomas and Anabel fully testifies. They grant that according to this form a chirograph be made between them in the king's court.¹⁷

[Cross-reference: B10]

B348.(Kant') Juratores de consensu parcium electi veniunt [ad] recognitura si Matilda de Bruneston' (et Willelmus de Fisseburnⁱ) in vigilia sancti Andree anno regni regis xlii vi et armis veniunt ad curiam Stephani Everard in Davington' et quemdam equum quem Stephanus ceperat et ibidem inparcaverat pro quodam servicio quod ei aretro fuit de quodam tenemento quod predicta Matilda de eodem Stephano tenuit, ceperunt et abduxerunt contra pacem etc. vel si Guido de Norton' ballivus Hundredi illius ad querelam predicte Matilde replegiavit ei predictum equum eo quod predictus Stephanus equum illum prius ei noluit dimittere per plevinam etc. Qui dicunt super scamentum suum quod predicta Matilda non tenuit aliquod tenementum de predicto Stephano nec aliquod servicium ei (dubuit^s). Et dicunt quod quamcito idem Stephanus cepisset predictum equum eadem Matilda adivit Magisterum Hospitalis de Ospreng' dominum predicti tenementi, et eidem questa fuit de predicto Stephano quod injuste ceperat predictum equum et injuste detinuit et invenit ei plegios de proseguendo et per quam plevinam idem Magister predictum equum fecit deliberare eidem Matilde. Et dicunt quod predicti Matilda et Willelmus predictum equum non ceperunt nec abduxerunt, nec etiam predictus Guido ballivus predictum equum ad quermoniam predicte Matilde fecit deliberare nec alio modo. Et super hoc venit predictus magister qui deliberavit predictum equum et cognoscit quod fecit deliberare predictum equum. Et quesitus si possit placitare in curia sua placita vetiti namii, dicit quod non. Ideo ipse in *misericordia*.¹⁸ Et similiter Stephanus in *misericordia*¹⁹ pro falso clamore. Et Matilda et Willelmus inde quieti.

B348.(Kent) The jurors elected by both parties come to declare if, during the vigils of Saint Andrew year 42 [29 November 1257], Matilda of Brownstone and William of Fishbourne came with force of arms to Stephen Everard's court in Davington and seized and abducted against the peace a horse which Stephen had seized and impounded for a certain service for which he was in arrears for from a tenement which Matilda held of him, or if Guy of Norton, the bailiff of that hundred, at Matilda's complaint redeemed the horse because Stephen previously did not wish to relinquish it on pledge. They say upon their oath that Matilda has not held any tenement of Stephen, nor has she owed him any service. They say that as soon as Stephen seized the horse, Matilda approached the master of the Hospital of Ospringe, lord of the tenement, and she complained of Stephen that he had unjustly seized the horse and detained it. She found pledges to prosecute, by which plaint the master freed the horse to Matilda. They say that Matilda and William did not seize the horse nor abduct it, nor did Guy, at Matilda's complaint, free the horse in any way. Concerning the above, the master comes and acknowledges that he freed the horse. [The master] was asked if it was possible to plead in his court pleas of *vee de naam*; he said no. So he [is] in *mercy*. Likewise, Stephen [is] in *mercy* for false claim. Matilda and William are quit.

[Membrane 21d.]

Hundredum de Brenchesleg' in Lesto de Eylesford'

The Hundred of Brenchley in the Lathe of Aylesford

B349.(T) Juratores presentant quod Abbas de Ponte Roberti tenet unum hundredeslond et dimidium in la Ware et in Hedon' et subtraxit (sectam hundredo iam sex annis elapsisⁱ) et etiam tenentes sui de eisdem hundredeslond', scilicet Stephanus le Tanur, Emeritus le Marescallus, Jordanus Textor et Thomas Sutor. (Et similiter idem Abbas et omnes tenentes sui per totum Comitatum Kantⁱ) subtraxerunt sectam ad Lawedayes. Et (tenentesⁱ) Ricardi

¹⁷CP 25 (1) 214/26/6

¹⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

¹⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

de Grey tenent duo hundredelond' in Staunden' et la Hale et subtraxerunt sectam hundredo iam duobus annis elapsis. (Et tenentes sui similiter^{ul}), scilicet Johannes de la Hale heredes Willelmi de la Hale, Ricardus de la Strate, Galfridus filius Osberti, Elyas de Staunden'. Dicunt etiam quod Prior de Tunebrig' tenet in Brenchesl' medietatem unius hundredelond' et subtraxit sectam hundredo. Et Ricardus Bruning', Orgarus de Bokenefeld, Jordanus et Thomas fratres eius, et Johannes le Hulk' tenentes ipsius Prioris tenent unum hundredelond' in Est Bokenefeld. Et Thomas vicarius de Brenchesel' tenet dimidiam hundredelond' in Brenchesel'. Item tenentes Johannis de Merleye in Suth Tonge tenent tres partes unius hundredelond' in eadem, scilicet Prior de Ledes', Robertus de Hedon', Rogerus Bolthod, Mabila Colkin. Et similiter tenentes eiusdem Johannis in West Tonge tenent unum hundredelond' in Brenchesel' et subtraxerunt sectam iam duobus annis elapsis, scilicet Johannes Tonge et fratres eius Robertus le Gont', Walterus de Tonge et Benedictus de Tonge. Item tenentes eiusdem Johannis in Stokeselle tenent dimidium hundredelond' et subtraxerunt sectam iam duobus annis elapsis, scilicet Algarus le Dore, Johannes le Turnur, Jordanus le Kat, Clemens le Kat, Walterus de Stokeselle (de^s) Ricardus de eadem et Gilbertus de eadem. Item tenentes Prioris de Cumwelle tenent dimidium hundredelond' in Stokeselle et subtraxerunt sectam iam duobus annis elapsis. Item tenentes Ricardi de Grey de Gumelinden' scilicet Willelmus de Gumelinden', Henricus frater eius, Hamo Hened, Walterus Stuby, Alexanderus filius Walteri fabri, Johannes filius Roberti de Molend', Jervasius filius Elredi, Robertus de Gumelinden', Willelmus et Ricardus fratres eius, Stephanus filius Galfridi, Walterus filius Galfridi et Ricardus frater eius et Galfridus le Cogger. Item tenentes Abbatisse de Malling' de Brenchsel' Malling, Lamberherst, Sandherst, Lyndrugge et Guterdingden' subtraxerunt se de scocagiis ad Lawedeye in Hundredo de Brechesl' et similiter tenentes sui de Marested', a tempore domini regis nunc. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat de cetero omnes predictos ad faciendas sectas predictas nisi ostendant warantum etc. Et sint in *misericordia*²⁰ pro subtraccione. Post venit Abbas de Ponte Roberti et protulit cartam domini Regis nunc, in qua continetur quod inspexit cartam Regis Ricardi avunculi per quam concessit Abbacie de Ponte Roberti omnia tenementa sua homines et redditus suos quiete de scotagiis, shyriis, (lez il^l) et hundredis. Et dominus Rex nunc per predictam cartam suam confirmat cartam predicti regis avunculi sui et concessionem illam eis factam etc. Et dicit quod tam per cartam predicti Regis Ricardi quam per confirmationem domini regis nunc semper usi sunt ea libertates quod homines sui quieti sunt de sectis comitatu et hundredo, tam tempore eiusdem Regis Ricardi quam semper postea. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Et iuratores ad hoc electi dicunt super sacramentum quod predictus dominus Rex Ricardus tempore confeccionis predicte carte (sueⁱ) et etiam post confeccionem eiusdem toto tempore suo et similiter dominus Rex Johannes et dominus Rex nunc temporibus suis semper fuerit in seisinam de sectis comitatu et hundredo percipiendis per manus omnium tenentum illorum feodorum que predictus Abbas modo tenet in comitatu isto, usque ad confeccionem predicte carte (domini regis nuncⁱ) quam idem Abbas profert de confirmatione quando predecessores istius Abbatis illas subtraxerunt. Et ideo consideratum est quod dominus Rex recuperet seisinam suam de predictis sectis. Et Abbas in *misericordia*.²¹ Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat de cetero omnes predictos tenentes ad predictas sectas faciendas. Et dampna remittuntur eidem Abbati eo quod temporibus predecessorum suorum subtraxerunt etc. Post veniunt predicti tenentes Ricardi de Grey de Staunden' et la Hale et recognoverunt quod subtraxerunt sectas predictas per Willelmum ballivum de Ho ideo [leaves off abruptly]

- 349.(T) The jurors present that the abbot of Robertsbridge holds one and a half hundredlands in la Ware and Haydon and he withdrew suit to the hundred some six years ago. He also [withdrew] his tenants from the same hundredland, namely Stephen le Tanner, Emery le Marshal, Jordan Textor and Thomas Sutor. Likewise, the abbot and all his tenants throughout the whole of the county of Kent withdrew suit to the lawdays. The tenants of Richard de Grey, namely John de la Hale heir of William de la Hale, Richard de la Street, Geoffrey son

²⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

of Osbert [and] Ellis of Standen, hold two hundredlands in Standen and la Hale. They withdrew suit to the hundred some two years ago. The jurors also say that the prior of Tonbridge holds half a hundredland in Brenchley and he withdrew suit to the hundred. Richard Browning, Oscar of Bockingfold, Jordan and Thomas his brothers and John le Hulk, the prior's tenants, hold one hundredland in East Bockingfold. Thomas the vicar of Brenchley holds half a hundredland in Brenchley. The tenants of John of Marley in South Tonge, namely the prior of Leeds, Robert of Haydon, Roger Bolthod [and] Mabel Colkin, hold three parts of one hundredland in the same place. Likewise, John's tenants in West Tonge, namely John Tonge and his brothers Robert le Gaunter, Walter of Tonge and Benedict of Tonge, hold one hundredland in Brenchley. They withdrew suit some two years ago. Also John's tenants in Stokeselle, namely Algar le Dove, John le Turnur, Jordan le Cat, Clement le Cat, Walter of Stockshill, Richard of the same place and Gilbert of the same place, hold half a hundredland. They withdrew suit some two years ago. The prior of Combwell's tenants hold half a hundredland in Stockshill. They withdrew suit some two years ago. Richard de Grey's tenants of Gilton, namely William of Gilton, Henry his brother, Hamo Hened, Walter Stuby, Alexander son of Walter smith, John son of Robert of Mill, Gervase son of Elred, Robert of Gilton, William and Richard his brothers, Stephen son of Geoffrey, Walter son of Geoffrey, Richard his brother and Geoffrey le Gogger [withdrew suit]. The abbess of Malling's tenants from Brenchley, Malling, Lamberhurst, Sandhurst, Lindridge and Gutteridge withdrew scots from the lawdays in the hundred of Brenchley and her tenants from Marested [did] likewise, during the present king's time. So the sheriff is ordered that, henceforward, he distrain all the aforesaid to make suit, unless they show a warrant. They are in *mercy* for withdrawal. Later, the abbot of Robertsbridge comes and brings a charter of the present king, which examined King Richard's charter by which [charter] Richard granted the abbot of Robertsbridge [the liberty] that all his tenements, men, and rents were quit of scots, shires, () and hundreds. The present king by his charter confirmed his grandfather's charter and he made the same grant. The abbot says that by Richard's charter as well as by the king's grant they have used this liberty, [namely] that the men are quit of suit to the county and hundred [courts] from Richard's time onward. On this he places himself on the country.

The jurors elected by both parties say upon their oath that King Richard, at the time he conferred his charter and from that time onwards and likewise during King John's time and the present king's time, was in seisin of suit to the county and hundred [courts], receiving at the hands of all the those who held in those fees, which [fees] the abbot now holds in this county, until the confirmation of the charter of the present king which the abbot produced concerning which confirmation the abbot's predecessors withdrew from. So it is adjudged that the king recovers his seisin of the suits. The abbot [is] in *mercy*. So the sheriff is ordered that henceforward he distrain all the aforesaid tenants to do suit. The amercement is remitted because the suit was withdrawn [during] the abbot's predecessors time. Afterwards, Richard de Grey's tenants of Standen and la Hale came and acknowledged that they have withdrawn suit through William the bailiff of Hoo. So
[Cross-reference: B358]

Septem Hundreda de Waldis infra Lestum de Shrewinghop'.

The Seven Hundreds of the Weald within the Lathe of Shipway Cross.

B350.(Hundredum de Rulvynden') Juratores presentant quod ballivi domini regis de Hundredo de Rulvynden' semper percipere consueverunt amerciamenta assise panis et cervisie non servate de singulis hominibus infra predictum hundredum tam de tenentibus Prioris sancte Trinitatis Cantuar' (et Archiepiscopi¹) quam de omnibus aliis et similiter omnemoda amerciamenta de aliis transgressionibus convictis infra predictum Hundredum (et omnia attachiamenta facere¹) usque ad tempus (sancti¹) Edmundi quondam Archiepiscopi Cantuar' quando predictus Prior -- ----impetravit a domino Rege retorna brevium habenda in omnibus predictis septem hundredis. Et postea Archiepiscopus qui nunc est impetravit retorna brevium habenda in omnibus feodis Ecclesie Cantuar'. Ita quod tempore suo fecerunt ballivi sui (omnemoda¹) attachiamenta in omnibus predictis feodis infra predicta septem hundreda et adhuc faciunt et similiter percipiunt amerciamenta predicta que ballivi domini regis percipere consueverunt. Ideo inde

loquendum.

B350.(Hundred of Rolvenden) The jurors present that the king's bailiffs from the hundred of Rolvenden were always accustomed to collect the amercements from the assize of bread and ale from each man within the hundred as well as from the prior of Saint Trinity of Canterbury tenants and from the archbishop's [tenants] as well as from all others. Likewise, [they were accustomed to collect] all sorts of amercements from those convicted of transgressions within the hundred and to make the attachments until Saint Edmund's time, once the archbishop of Canterbury, when the prior----- obtained from the king the return of writs from within all the seven hundreds. Afterwards, the present archbishop obtained the return of writs in all the church of Canterbury's fees. Thus from his time on his bailiffs made the attachments in all the fees within the seven hundreds. They still do, and likewise they collect the amercements which the king's bailiffs were accustomed to collect. So *it is to be discussed*.

B351. Abbas de Bello venit et dicit quod debet habere duas partes amerciametorum et omnium proficium provenientium de omnibus forisfacturis et placitis septem hundreda de Waldis de dono domini regis W. le Bastard. Quas quidem duas partes predecessores sui semper percipere consueverunt usque in tempore domini regis nunc, quando Willelmus de Kasingham qui habuit predicta vii hundreda ad feodi firmam retinuit predictas duas partes. Et Abbas quesitus quid habet ex concessione predicti Willelmi regis, protulit cartam eiusdem W. (regis¹) Conquestoris -- in hec verba, W. dei gracia Rex Anglie etc. Do Abbati et monachis de Bello duos denarios de omnibus forisfacturis et placitis omnium hundredorum que pertinent ad summonicionem de Wy. Ideo inde *loquendum* cum domino Rege.

B351. The abbot of Battle comes and says that he ought to have two parts of the amercements and all the profits collected from all the forfeitures and pleas in the seven hundreds of the Weald as a gift from [William] the Bastard. Those two parts his predecessors were always accustomed to collect, until the present king's time when William of Kensham, who held the 7 hundreds at farm-fee withheld the two parts. The abbot was asked what he had by grant from King William. He produced a charter of [William] the Conqueror's in these words: [William] by grace of God King of England etc., I give the abbot and the monks of Battle two pence from all the forfeitures and pleas from all the hundreds which belong to the summons of Wye. So *it is to be discussed* with the king.

B352. Juratores presentant quod Radulfus de Oteringeden' tenet unum hundredelond' in Sangden' pro quo antecessores sui solebant facere sectam ad hundredum de Cranebrok' et antecessores sui subtraxerunt sectam iam xx^{ti} annis elapsis. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat predictum Radulfum ad faciendam predictam sectam.

B352. The jurors present that Ralph of Otterden holds one hundredland in Saynden for which his ancestors were accustomed to do suit to the hundred of Cranbrook and his ancestors withdrew the suit some 20 years ago. So the sheriff is ordered that he distrain Ralph to do the suit.

B353. Juratores presentant quod Stephanus ballivus de Ospreng' injuste cepit et extorsit de herede Johannis de Hokeregge xl solidos antequam voluit permittere predictum heredem habere seisinam de hereditate patris sui. Ideo ipse in *misericordia*²² et restituat predicto herede predictos xl solidos. Plegii predicti Stephani de misericordia sua; [leaves off abruptly]

B353. The jurors present that Stephen the bailiff of Ospringe unjustly seized and extorted 40 shillings from John of Hawkridge's heir before he would allow the heir to have seisin of his father's inheritance. So he [is] in *mercy*. He shall restore the 40 shillings to the heir. Stephen's pledges for the amercement

B354.(Blakeburn') Presentantum est per juratam quod Aluredus de Denne cepit injuste de Alano de Hyaden' xl solidos eo quod noluit esse prepositus eius in manerio suo de Werehorn'. Et de

²²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Roberto de Alkinden' ii marcas et dimidiam eadem occasione. Et quod vexavit quendam Johannem de Eyldersaye similiter eadem occasione ad dampnum ipsius Johannis xx solidos etc.

Et Aluredus venit et bene cognoscit quod cepit de predictis Alano et Roberto predictos denarios et juste, quia dicit quod predicti Alanus et Robertus et quamplures alii in predicto manerio suo tenent tenementa sua in servicio de gavelikend' et quod debent et solent esse prepositi sui in eodem manerio. Et quia ipse voluit constituere eos prepositos suos et per consideracionem curie sue, fecerunt ipsi finem cum eo per predictos denarios. Et ipse quesitus si debeant ministrare ei in officio prepositi sumptibus propriis aut ad custum ipsius Aluredi, dicit ad custum suum, scilicet quod inveniet eis necessaria sua in victu solummodo sicuti uni de liberis servientibus suis dum modo fuerint in officio predicto. [leaves off abruptly]

B354.(Blackbourne) It is presented by the jury that Alfred of Dean unjustly took 40 shillings from Alan of Hayden, because Alan did not wish to be his steward on his manor of Warehorn. [Alfred took] two and a half marks from Robert of Alkerden for the same reason. He harassed John of Eyldersaye for the same reason, to John's loss of 20 shillings.

Alfred comes and acknowledges that he took the money from Alan and Robert and justly so, since he says that Alan and Robert and numerous others on his manor hold their tenements in gavelkind and they ought [to be], and usually are, his stewards on the manor. Since he wished to appoint them as his stewards and by verdict of his court, they made fine with him for the aforesaid money. He was asked if they ought to serve him in the office of steward at their own cost or his cost. He said at his cost such that while they held the aforesaid office, he should find them sustenance as if [they were] one of his free serjeants.

B355.(Blakeburn') Homines de Borgh' de Hallebrig' et Tybinden' queruntur de hominibus Comitiss Leycestr' de Braburne subtraxerunt se de sectis faciendis ad Hundredum de Blakeburn' iam anno elapso ad dampnum eorum iii solidos. Et quod quidam latro qui captus fuit in Hundredo isto, ductus fuit extra predictum Hundredum usque in Hundredo de Byrcholt et ibi fecerunt iudicium de eo in prejudicium libertatis alterius hundredi. Et super hoc venit quidam Matheus ballivus predictis Comitiss et dicit quod dominus Rex nunc dedit cuidam Willelmo le Marescallo juniore predictum manerium de Braburn' cum dimidio Hundredo de Bircholt ----- et manerium de Sutton' in Hundredo de Eyhorn' et manerium de Kemesing' cum pertinentiis in Hundredo de Titeford' in maritagium cum Alianora Comitissa Leyc' que nunc est, cum omnibus libertatibus ad predicta maneria pertinentibus, scilicet thol et theam et infongenethef. Et dicit quod tempore ipsius (Willelmi¹) Mariscalli et semper postea fuerunt homines de predictis maneriis queiti de omnimodis sectis comitatu et hundredo, unde dicit quod sine predictis Comite et Comitisse non potest ipse rem istam deducere in iudicium, set pro jure domini regis inquiratur rei veritas tam per juratam istius lesti quam de Lesto de Eyleford' eo quod manerii sunt in utroque lesto. Et juratores de Lesto de Eyleford' dicunt quod homines de manerio de Sutton' semper quieti fuerunt de omnimodis sectis comitatu et hundredo post predictam donacionem. Et juratores de isto lesto dicunt quod homines de Braburn' fecerunt predictas sectas usque iam anno elapso. Ideo inde loquendum. Juratores tum utriusque lesti dicunt quod predictus Comes semper usi fuerit habendi infongenethef et faciendi iudicia de latronibus captis infra predicta maneria.

B355.(Blackbourne) The men of the tithing of [?Hale Bridge] and Tiffenden complain against the earl of Leicester's men from Brabourne that they withdrew themselves from suit to the hundred of Blackbourne one year ago to their loss of 3 shillings. [They also complain that whereas] a thief was arrested in the hundred he was led outside this hundred to the hundred of Bircholt and there they judged him in prejudice to the liberties of the other hundreds. Concerning this, Matthew, the earl's bailiff, comes. He says that the present king gave William le Marshal junior the manor of Brabourne with half the hundred of Bircholt, ----- the manor of Sutton in the hundred of Eyhorne and the manor of Kemsing with appurtenances in the hundred of Titeford with all the liberties pertaining to the aforesaid manors namely *toll*, *team* and *infongenethef*, in marriage with Eleanor, the present countess of Leicester. He says that from William Marshal's time onward, the men from the manors were quit of all suits to

the county and hundred [courts]. Wherefore, he says that without the earl and the countess he cannot decide these things in judgement, except by the king's right to inquire into the truth by a jury of this lathe as well as one from the lathe of Aylesford, because the manors are in both lathes. The jurors from the lathe of Aylesford say that the men from the manor of Sutton were always quit of all suits to the county and hundred [courts] after the gift. The jurors of this lathe say that the men from Brabourne made the suit until one year ago. So it is to be discussed. The jurors of both lathes said that the earl always had the right of *infongenethef* and to judge thieves arrested within the manors.

[Membrane 21d.]

Adhuc de Septem Hundreda de Wald' et Hundredo De Tenturden'.

Still Concerning the Seven Hundreds of the Weald and the Hundred of Tenterden.

B356. Johannes Spynard' [et] Galfridus Poygnaund queruntur (de Willelmoⁱ) de Hemminghersy et Johanne le Rok' quod predictus Willelmus (et Johannesⁱ) die Epiphanie domini anno xliii venerunt ad domum ipsius Johannis Spynard' et insultum fecerunt in ipsum et predictum Galfridum. Ita quod predictus Johannes le Rok' sagittavit predictum Johannem Spynard' et fecit ei quandam plagam in capite. Et tam predictum Willelmum quam predictum Johannem verberaverunt, vulneraverunt et malectraverunt contra pacem etc. unde dicit quod deteriorati sunt et dampnum habent ad valenciam xx marcarum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et predicti Willelmus et Johannes veniunt et deffendunt vim et injuriam quando. Et dicunt quod volunt cognoscere quandam veritatem quia dicunt quod cum averia predicti Willelmi inparcata essent in parco Prioris de Bilsington' eo quod inventa fuerunt in dampno predicti Prioris et predicti Willelmus et Johannes venissent ad averia illa replegianda, predictus Prior non permisit averia illa replegiare. Set predicti Johannes Spynard' et Galfridus Pygnaunt qui cum dicto Priore erant insultum fecerunt in ipsos et ipsos in secuti fuerunt cum fustibus et aliis armis. Ita quod predictus Johannes le Rok' se ipsum deffendendo sagittavit versus predictos Johannem Spynard' et Galfridum (quondam bothono^{s i}) set nescuit si aliquem ipsorum percussit nec ne. Et predictus Willelmus dicit quod nullam transgressionem fecit predictis Johanni nec Galfrido. Et de hoc ponunt se super patriam. Et quia convictum est per juratam quod predictus Willelmus non est cuilpabiles de aliqua transgressionem ei facta ideo predictus inde quietus. Et predicti Johannes Spynard' et Galfridus Pygnaund in *misericordia*²³ pro falso clamore versus (ipsos^s) convictum est etiam quod predictus Johannes le Rok' sagittavit predictum Johannem Spynard' et fecit ei quandam plagam in capite. Ideo predictus Johannes Rok' committatur *gaole*.²⁴ Et satisfaciat Johanni Spynard' de dampnis suis que taxanatur ad x solidos. Et quia testatum est quod quidam Lambinus vulneravit predictum Johannem ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod capiat eum et eum habeat ad respondendum etc. Misericordia Johannis Spynard' perdonatur per cancellarium.

B356. John Spynard [and] Geoffrey Poynant complain against William of Heminghersy and John le Rock that William and John came to John Spynard's home, on the Epiphany of the Lord year 43 [6 January 1259], and they insulted him and Geoffrey. John le Rock fired arrows at John Spynard and wounded John Spynard in the head. William as well as John beat, wounded and maltreated [them] against the peace. Wherefore, they say that they have suffered damage to the value of 20 marks. Thereon they produce suit.

William and John come and deny force and injury. They say that they wish to know the truth. They say that whereas William's beasts were impounded on the prior of Bilsington's park, because they were found at the prior's loss, William and John came to re-pledge the beasts [and] the prior did not allow the beasts to be repledged. But, John Spynard and Geoffrey Poynant, who were with the prior, insulted them and pursued them with clubs and other arms. Thus, John le Rock defended himself by firing arrows at John Spynard and Geoffrey when a bolt struck John, but he does not know if one of theirs struck him or not.

²³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²⁴Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

William says that he made no transgression to John or Geoffrey. On this they place themselves on the country. Since it is determined by a jury that William is not guilty of any transgression, he is quit. John Spynard and Geoffrey Poynant [are] in mercy for false claim. It is also determined that John le Rock fired arrows at John Spynard and wounded John Spynard in the head. So John le Rok is to be committed to *gaol*. He shall satisfy John Spynard of his damages which were assessed at 10 shillings. Since it is testified that Lambinus wounded John, so the sheriff is ordered to arrest him and have him here to answer. John Spynard's amercement is pardoned by the chancellor.

B357. Willelmus de Tanet queritur de Magistero Hospitalis sancti Thome de Cantuar' quod cum dedisset predicto Magistero quinque marcas per sic quod predictus Magister inveniret ei sustentacionem suam in predicto hospitali ad vitam suam; predictus Magister nuper amovit ipsum de predicto hospitalo et posuit eum in Hospitali de Northgate apud Cantuar' ubi non habet sustentacionem suam rationabilem sicut habuit in predicto Hospitali sancti Thome, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xx solidorum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et predictus Magister venit et non potest dedicere (quem^s) recepit predictas ^vque marcas et (quin^s) teneatur ei ad inveniendum sustentacionem suam nec (quem^s) minus sufficienter habet sustentacionem suam in predicto hospitali de Northgate quam habere consuevit. Et ideo preceptum est predicto Magistero quod recipiat eum in Hospitali sancti Thome ubi eum prius admisit. Et quod inveniat ei rationabilem sustentacionem sicut prius habuit.

B357. William of Thanet complains against the master of the Hospital of Saint Thomas of Canterbury that since he gave the master five marks on the condition that the master would find him his sustenance in the hospital for the rest of his life, the master recently removed him from the hospital and placed him in the Hospital of Northgate at Canterbury, where he does not have his sustenance as he had it in the Hospital of Saint Thomas. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 20 shillings. Thereon he produces suit.

The master comes and cannot deny that he received the 5 marks and that he is held to provide him his sustenance, nor [can he deny] that William had less than enough sustenance at the Hospital of Northgate. So the master is ordered to return William to the Hospital of Saint Thomas where he was previously admitted and he shall find William reasonable sustenance just as he [previously] had.

Hundreda De Selbrightindene

The Hundred of Selbritten

B358. Juratores presentant quod homines Abbatis de Ponte Roberti iam tribus annis elapsis (elapsis^r) subtraxerunt se de faciendo sectam ad hundredum de Selbrightinden' quam semper antea facere consueverunt. Et Abbas venit et modo dicit sicut alias quod habuit cartam regis Ricardi et confirmacionem regis nunc per quam habuit talem libertatem quod homines sui debent esse quieti de sectis comitatu et hundredo Ideo de ista subtracione fiat sicut de aliis in Lesto de Eyleford' [leaves off abruptly]

B358. The jurors present that the abbot of Robertsbridge's men withdrew themselves, some three years ago, from suit to the hundred of Selbritten which suit they were accustomed [to make]. The abbot comes and now, as elsewhere, says that he has King Richard's charter and a confirmation from the present king by which he has the liberty that his men are quit of suit to the county and hundred [courts]. So for this withdrawal just as for the others in the lathe of Aylesford [the abbot is in mercy].
[Cross-reference: B349]

B359. Convictum est quod Ricardus de Ripple ballivus Archiepiscopi injuste cepit de Hundredo de Selbrighgtinden' dimidiam marcam ad sepeliendum quendam puerum mortuum inventum. Et homines de dicto hundredo sequuntur. Ideo predictus Ricardus respondeat eis de predicta

dimidia marca. Et sit in *misericordia*.²⁵

B359. It is determined that Richard of Ripple the archbishop's bailiff unjustly took a half mark from the hundred of Selbritten for the burial of a boy found dead. The men of the hundred press suit. So Richard shall answer to them for the half mark. He [is] in *mercy*.

B360. Gilbertus filius Elye de Roff' Draparii queritur de Roberto de Uldham quod cum predictus Robertus vendidisset ei unum cassum pisarum pro sex marcis die Martis proximo ante diem Cynerum anno xli. Et idem Gilbertus satisfacisset ei de quinquaginta solidis et x denariis de predicta pecunia ut in denariis eidem Roberto allocatis pro panno ei prius credito et similiter pro uno equo quem prius ei vendidit et de residuo promptus esset ei satisfacere ad mediam xL^am proximo sequentem, predictus Robertus postea triturare fecit predictum cassum ad opus suum proprium et ei predictas pisas huc usque detinuit unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam C solidorum. Et inde producit sectam etc. [Leaves off abruptly]

B360. Gilbert son of Ellis of Rochester a draper complains against Robert of Wouldham that since Robert, on the first Tuesday before Ash Wednesday year 41 [20 February 1257], sold him one rick of pease for six marks and Gilbert satisfied him of 50 shillings and 10 pence of the money, as the money allocated to Robert for bread [which] Gilbert previously bought and likewise for one horse which he sold him and concerning the rest [of the money] he would be ready to satisfy him in the middle of Lent, Robert afterwards threshed the rick to his own benefit and he still withholds the pease from him. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 100 shillings. Thereon he produces suit.

Hundredum De Faveresham

The Hundred of Faversham

B361.(T) Juratores presentant quod Abbas de Faveresham semper capit fines de hominibus infra predictum hundredum pro assisa panis et cervisie non servata et nuncquam faciat eos subire iudicium super hoc statutum ad dampnum totius patrie. Et ideo preceptum est ei quod de cetero non percipiat fines neque amerciamenta pro predicto delicto. Immo fieri faciat inde iudicium etc.

B361.(T) The jurors present that the abbot of Faversham always took the fines from the men within the hundred for the assize of bread and ale and he never showed them justice on this statute to the loss of the entire country. So he is ordered that henceforward he shall neither collect the fines nor the amercements for the aforesaid offence, instead he shall cause justice to be done [thereon].

B362. Iidem presentant quod singuli ballivi Lesti de Shrewingh' iam x annis elapsis usi sunt ponere xxx vel xl homines ballivorum suorum in assisas summonitas apud Grenewiz et frequenter capiunt de pluribus eorum denarios scilicet de aliquibus xii denarios de aliquibus ii solidos ad relaxandum eos exceptis xii vel xvi ad plus qui necessarii sunt inter esse ad faciendas illas assisas. Ideo ipsi in *misericordia*,²⁶ scilicet Johannes de Braburn', alli ballivi obierunt. Et similiter (Johannesⁱ) in *misericordia* pro pluribus aliis transgressionibus.

B362. The same present that each bailiff from the lathe of Shipway Cross, some 10 years ago, used to post 30 or 40 men from their bailiwicks to the summons of the assizes at Greenwiche, and they frequently took money from the men, namely from some 12 pence and from others 2 shillings to release them, except 12 or 16 at the most who were needed to make the assizes. So they [are] in *mercy*, namely John of Brabourne, the other bailiffs have died. Likewise, John [is] in *mercy* for numerous other transgressions.

²⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

²⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B363. Juratores presentant quod Walterus de Bergsted' quondam vicecomes distrinxit homines forinsecos Hundredi de Faveresham ad solvendo ei centum solidos pro evasione cuiusdam latronis qui evasit a priona Abbatis de Faveresham apud Faversham. Quos quidem denarios idem Walterus recepit. Ideo veniat predictus Walterus ad respondendum etc.

Item presentant quod cepit i marcā de villate de Stanesfeld' hospitalo quam eadem villata prius soluerat per summonicionem scaccarii. Ideo veniat et respondeat (indeⁱ) similiter etc.

Post venit predictus Walterus et cognoscit quod recepit predictam marcā, sed dicit quod soluit eam ad scaccarium. Et quia compertum est quod preceptum fuit (eiⁱ) a baronibus de scaccario quod redderet illam marcā predictis hominibus, eo quod prius paccata fuit ibidem et quod ei allocaretur. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat eum ad predictam solucionem faciendam et quod sequatur allocacionem ad scaccarium etc.

B363. The jurors present that Walter of Bursted, once a sheriff, distrained the foreign men of the hundred of Faversham to pay him one hundred shillings for the escape of a thief, who escaped from the abbot of Faversham's prison at Faversham. Walter kept the money. So Walter shall come to answer.

They also present that he took 1 mark from the vill of Stanfield Hospital, which [mark] the vill had already paid by means of the summons from the exchequer. So he shall likewise come to answer.

Afterwards, Walter comes and acknowledges that he received the mark, but he says that he paid it to the exchequer. Since it is discovered that he was ordered by the barons of the exchequer to return the mark to the men because it was already paid there and it is to be allotted to him, so the sheriff is ordered to distrain him to pay and to seek an allowance at the exchequer.

B364. Ricardus filius Mabile et Willemus Beauneysin queruntur de Thoma Albelin quod imprisonavit predictum Ricardum et uxorem eius et ⁱⁱⁱⁱ^{or} pueros suos in Castro Roffe dum fuit vicecomes et eos in priona detinuit quousque predictus Ricardus soluisset ei xl solidos. Et quod extorsit a predicto Willemo xvi solidos et compulsit eum ad vendendam i acram terre postquam eam recuperaverat coram H. de Bathon' et sociis suis iusticiariis etc.

Et Thomas venit et bene concedit quod cepit predictos xl solidos de predicto Ricardo et juste, quia dicit quod idem Ricardus indictatus fuit ad quandam inquisitionem factam super quandam mulierem occisam de morte eiusdem, ob quod ipsum et familiam suam que similiter indicta fuit cepit et inprisonavit et dicit quod idem Ricardus dedit ei predictos denarios pro liberatione [a] priona habenda. Dicit etiam quod predictus Willemus promisit ei predictos xvi solidos per sic quod esset ei in auxilium de quadam terra perquirenda et ea occasione ipsum distringere fecit pro predictis denariis. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Juratores dicunt quod revera predictus Ricardus et uxor et pueri sui indictati fuerunt de predicti morte propter quod predictus Thomas eos cepit, et dicunt quod idem Thomas cepit ab eo predictos *xl solidos*²⁷ pro ipsis deliberandis extra priona. Ideo in *misericordia*.²⁸ Et solvat domino rege predictos denarios. Dicunt etiam quod predictus Willemus non fecit eidem Thome predictum ([promissionem]^{il}) immo extorsit ab eo predictos xvi solidos. Ideo satisfaciat eidem Willemo de (eidem^s) denariis et sit in misericordia.

B364. Richard son of Mabel and William Beauneys complain against Thomas Aubeney that, while he was the sheriff, he imprisoned Richard, his wife and his 4 boys in Rochester castle and he held them until Richard paid him 40 shillings. [They also complain that] Thomas extorted 16 shillings from William and forced him to sell 1 acre of land after Willaim had recovered it before [Henry] de Bath and his colleagues, justices.

Thomas comes and readily maintains that he took the 40 shillings from Richard and justly so, since he says that Richard was indicted at an inquiry held concerning a murdered woman on account of which he and his family, who were likewise indicted, were arrested and

²⁷Margin note by scribe, xl. s. crossed out.

²⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

imprisoned. He says that Richard gave him the money to be free from prison. He also says that William promised him the 16 shillings on condition that he help him to acquire certain land and he distrained him on the occasion for the money. On this he places himself on the country.

The jurors say that Richard and his wife and sons were indicted for the death itself on account of which Thomas arrested them. They say that Thomas took the 40 *shillings* from them to free them from prison. So he [is] in *mercy*. He shall satisfy the king of the money. They also say that William made no ([promise]) to Thomas, rather he extorted the 16 shillings from him. So he shall satisfy William of the money. He is in *mercy*.

B365. Alicia uxor Johannis de Merewurth' ponit loco suo ipsum Johannem virum suum versus (^s) de Shorne de placito transgressionis etc.

B365. Alice wife of John of Mereworth appoints as her attorney her husband John against [name omitted] of Shorne concerning a plea of trespass.

[Membrane 22]

Adhuc de Hundredo de Faverersham

Still Concerning the Hundred of Faversham

B366. Convictum est per juratam in quos Willelmus de Stopesdon' et Rogerus frater eius se posuerunt quod ipsi asportaverunt vesturam de dimidia acra terre quam Hugo de Stopedon' tenuit ad terminum ex dimissione cuiusdam Beatrite Sperot occasione cuiusdam Godeline filie ipsius Beatrite quam habuit (in custodia¹) per Sarram de Campania. Ideo ipsi restitui faciant eidem Hugoni predictam vesturam que modo est super idem tenementum. Et sint in *misericordia*²⁹ pro transgressionem.

B366. It is determined by the jury on which William of Stopesden' and Roger his brother placed themselves that they carried off the crop from a half acre of land which Hugh of Stopesden' held for a term by demise from Beatrice Sperot, because of Godeline, Beatrice's daughter, whom she held in custody through Sarah of Champaines. So they shall restore the crop which is now upon the tenement to Hugh. They are in *mercy* for the transgression.

B367. Convictum est etiam quod predictus Hugo injuste questus fuit de predictis Willelmo et Rogero de quadam verberatura, eo quod ipsi ambo postea posuerunt se inde in arbitrium proborum virorum de consensu parcium. Qui (ei^s) arbitrando adjudicaverunt ei iiii^{or} solidos pro transgressionem illa. Et quod ipsi ei postea optulerunt eidem Hugoni predictos denarios et ipse illos recipere recusavit. Ideo satisfaciat ei modo predictos iiii^{or} solidos. Et Hugo in *misericordia*³⁰ pro falso clamore.

B367. It is also determined that the aforesaid Hugh unjustly complained against the aforesaid William and Roger concerning a beating, because they both subsequently placed themselves in arbitration with proven men elected by both sides. The men in arbitrating adjudicated 4 shillings to Hugh for that transgression. Afterwards, William and Roger brought the money to Hugh and he refused to receive it. So he shall now satisfy them of the 4 shillings. Hugh [is] in *mercy* for false claim.

B368. Petrus de la Childe queritur de Johanne de la Childe quod cum idem Johannes dimisisset ei xviii acras terre cum pertinenciis in Thrulegh' tenendas ad terminum trium annorum pro xvi solidis annuatim inde reddendis etc. Postea convictum est per recordum ipsius Petri quod falso questus fuit ideo ipse in *misericordia*³¹ pro falso clamore.

²⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

³¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B368. Peter de la Child complains against John de la Child that whereas John demised him 28 acres of land in Throwley to hold for a 3 year term rendering yearly 16 shillings etc. Later it was determined by Peter's own admission that he falsely complained. So he [is] in *mercy* for false claim.

Hundredum de Langebreg'

The Hundred of Longbridge

B369. Radulfus Burdel in [sit] *misericordia*³² pro falso clamore versus Ricardum de Sharsted'.

B369. Ralph Burdel [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Richard of Sharstead.

B370. Convictum est quod Simo Lovell' dum fuit ballivus Archiepiscopi ita ligavit et malectravavit quemdam Radulphum Burdel captum pro indictamento recepitamenti quod idem Radulphus ob gravissimam penam fecit finem cum eodem Simone per *iiii*^{or} solidos (cum^s) ipsum postea acquietasset de predicto indictamento. Ideo satisfaciat ei de predictis *iiii*^{or} solidis. Et sit in *misericordia*.³³

B370. It is determined that Simon Lovel, while he was the archbishop's bailiff, tied up and maltreated Ralph Burdel, arrested on the indictment of harbouring [criminals]. Thus Ralph, on account of the great suffering, made fine with Simon for 4 shillings [so that] Simon might acquit him of the indictment. So Simon shall satisfy him of the 4 shillings. He is in *mercy*.

B371.(Hundredum de Chert) Convictum est etiam per juratam in quos Henricus Lovell' se posuit quod cepit de Ricardo de Herst unam marcam que venit in summonicione de debito cuiusdam judei, in quo idem Ricardus tenebatur, et ipsum inde non acquietavit. Ita quod iterato eam soluit pro defectum ipsius Henrici. Ideo satisfaciat ei de predicta marca. Et sit in *misericordia*³⁴ pro transgressione.

B371.(The Hundred of Chart) It is determined by the jury on which Henry Lovel placed himself that he took one mark from Richard of Hurst, who came in summons concerning a debt to a jew, in which [debt] Richard is held and he has not acquitted him. Thus, Richard paid again for Henry's default. So he shall satisfy him of the mark. He is in *mercy* for the transgression.

B372.(*Misericordia*³⁵) Convictum est etiam quod Thomas de Windfeld' quondam ballivus Hundredi de Chert injuste cepit de quodam Willelmo le Moun' quoddam juvenum pretii xii solidorum, iam x annis, eo quod non potuit intrare infra libertatem Archiepiscopi de Swyneford' ad distringendum Borgam de Swineford' pro quodam amerciamento ad quod amerciata fuit. Ideo satisfaciat ei de predictis xii solidis. Et Thomas pauper est. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat predictum Thomam ad reddendum predictos xii solidos et etiam dampna sua que taxanatur ad vi solidos.

B372.(*Mercy*) It is determined that Thomas of Wingfield, once the bailiff of the hundred of Chart, unjustly took William le Miller's calf worth 12 shillings, some 10 years ago, because Thomas could not enter within the archbishop's liberty of Swinford to distrain the tithing of Swinford for an amercement for which it was amerced. So he shall satisfy William of the 12 shillings. Thomas is poor. So the sheriff is ordered that he distrain Thomas to render the 12 shillings and also the damages which are assessed at 6 shillings.

³²Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

³³Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

³⁴Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

³⁵Margin note by scribe, *mia*' crossed out.

B373. Hamo Do(^{il})the in *misericia*³⁶ pro contemptu curie.

B373. Hamo Do()the [is] in *mercy* for contempt of court.

B374.(Hundreda de Shamel', T) Walterus But queritur de Henrico de Brewe quod idem Henricus die [blank] proxima ante festum sancti Andree anno xxx vi et armis venit ad terram ipsius Walteri in Trotesclyve simul cum multis aliis manuarmatis scilicet cum gladiis, hachiis, furcis ferreis, arcubus et sagittis et carucam suam arrantem arrestaverunt et attilium eiusdem sciderunt et quendam bovem et unam vaccam ipsius Walteri pretii xviii solidorum in predicta caruca trahentes ceperunt et abduxerunt et illos adhuc detinent, et ipsum Walterum verberaverunt et maletractaverunt contra pacem etc. Et unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl solidorum. Et inde producit sectam.

Et Henricus venit et defendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene defendit quod ipse predicto die non venit vi et armis ad terram ipsius (Henrici^s) in predicta villa, nec attilium caruce sue scidit neque fregit, nec ipsum Walterum verberavit nec maletractavit contra pacem etc. Set dicit quod vult cognoscere quandam veritatem. Dicit enim quod predicta villata de Trotteclyve que est infra libertatem Archiepiscopi Cantuar' amerciata fuit coram justiciariis ad unam marcam que tunc venit in summonicione de scaccario levanda. Ita quod vicecomes qui tunc temporis fuit, fecit extractas suas ballivis predicti Archiepiscopi domini sui ad levandam predictam marcam simul cum aliis debitis domini regis. Et dicit quod ipse ex precepto eorumdem ballivorum distrinxit predictam villatam per predictum bovem et predictam vaccam pro predicta marca, unde bene cognoscit quod (ipse tamquam ballivus domini regisⁱ) illos cepit et abduxit et pro debito domini regis predicto, set quod nullam aliam transgressionem fecit predicto Waltero ponit se super patriam. Et Walterus similiter.

Juratores de consensu parcium electi dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Henricus simul cum multitudine armatorum circiter trescentorum hominum venit ad terram predicti Walteri in predicta villa, et attilium caruce eiusdem Walteri scidit, et predictos bovem et vaccam cepit et abduxit, set dicunt quod hoc fecit ex precepto ballivorum predicti Archiepiscopi et pro debito domini regis levando ut intellegiunt, scilicet pro predicta marca ad quam predicta villata de Trotteclyve amerciata fuit coram justiciariis ut dicebatur. Et ipsi quesiti si predictus Henricus vel aliquis alius ballivus predicti Archiepiscopi unquam prius fuisset impeditus de districcione facienda in predicta villa pro debito, vel aliqua recursio averiorum eis facta ob quod predictus Henricus habuit necesse veniendi manuarmata ad predictam districcione faciendam; dicunt quod non. [leaves off abruptly]

B374.(The Hundred of Shamwell, T) Walter Budds complains against Henry de Briwerr that Henry, on the first before the feast of Saint Andrew year 30 [1245], came to Walter's land in Trottiscliffe with force of arms along with many others at arms, namely with swords, axes, iron forks, bows and arrows. [There] they seized his plough and tore apart his plough equipment and seized an ox and a cow, worth 18 shillings, and abducted them. They still withhold them. They beat and maltreated Walter against the peace. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 40 shillings. Thereon he produces suit.

Henry comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that he did not come on the aforesaid day to [Walter's] land in the vill with force of arms, nor did he tear apart his plough equipment nor destroy it, nor did he beat or maltreat Walter. But he says he wishes to know the truth. He says that the vill of Trottiscliffe, which is within the archbishop of Canterbury's liberty, was amerced before the justices for one mark. He then came by summons from the exchequer to raise it. Thus, the current sheriff made the estreat to the archbishop's bailiffs to raise the mark along with the king's other debts. He says that he, at the bailiffs' orders, distrained the vill through the ox and cow for the mark. Wherefore, he readily acknowledges that he, as the king's bailiff, took and abducted [them] for the king's debt. But, he made no transgression against Walter. On this he places himself on the country. Walter [does] likewise.

The jurors elected by both parties say upon their oath that Henry, along with many others at arms nearly three hundred in number, came to Walter's land in the vill and tore apart

³⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Walter's plough equipment and took and abducted the ox and cow. But, as they understood it this was done on the orders of the archbishop's bailiffs to raise the king's debt, namely for one mark concerning which the vill of Trottscliffe had been amerced before the justices, as is said. They were asked if Henry or any of the archbishop's bailiffs were ever previously impeded from distraining the vill for a debt or in any recovery of beasts, on account of which Henry needed to come under arms to make the distraint; they said no.
[Cross-references: ? B333, ? B335]

B375. Abbas de Faversham queritur de Ricardo de Grey (constabulario^s) Doverie et Custode Quinque portuum quod predictus Ricardus die Lune proxima ante Assumpcionem beate Marie (anno xliiⁱ) venit apud Faversham et fecit congregare communitatem ville de Faversham et tenuit ibi quandam curiam de hominibus ipsius Abbatis que spectat ad ipsum Abbatem tenenda et placitavit in curia illa placita (placita^r) que spectant ad ipsum Abbatem placitanda contra libertatem ipsius Abbatis etc. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eum venire ----- apud Westmonasterium in Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie.

Idem Abbas queritur de predicto Ricardo, Johanne Doye et Johanne filii Alexanderi de hoc quod cum quidam Jacobus le Smale, Hamo de Bocton', Dyonisius filius Alexanderi Blundi, Christiana uxor Willelmi pistoris rettati de quadam roberia capti essent in libertate predicti Abbatis et imprisonati in prisa predicti Abbatis de Faversham predicti Johannes Doy et Johannes filius Alexanderi ex precepto et missione predicti Ricardi venerunt die veneris ante festum beati Thome Apostolici hoc anno ad predictam prisonam et predictam prisonam fregerunt et predictos incarceratos abstraxerunt et eos duxerunt ad Castrum Doverie et ibi eos inprisonaverunt et adhuc in prisa detinent contra libertatem predicti Abbatis et contra pacem etc. Ideo precetum est vicecomiti quod faciat venire predictos Ricardum, Johannem et Johannem in Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie apud Westmonasterium etc.

B375. The abbot of Faversham complains against Richard de Grey, constable of Dover and custodian of the Cinque Ports, that Richard, on the first Monday before the Assumption of the Blessed Mary year 42 [12 August 1258], came to Faversham and gathered the community of the vill of Faversham. There, against the abbot's liberty, he held a court concerning the abbot's men, which [court] belongs to the abbot. Richard pleaded pleas in that court which belong to the abbot. So the sheriff is ordered to make him come----- to Westminster in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February].

The abbot also complains against the aforesaid Richard, John Doye and John son of Alexander concerning this; that since James le Small, Hamo of Boughton, Denis son of Alexander Blund, [and] Christiana wife of William baker were accused of robbery and were arrested within the abbot's liberty and imprisoned in the abbot's prison at Faversham, John Doye and John son of Alexander, on Richard's orders and plan came to the prison, on the Friday before the feast of the Blessed Thomas the Apostle year 43 [20 December 1258], and destroyed the prison and removed the prisoners. They led them to Dover castle and there they imprisoned them. They still detain them against the abbot's liberty and against the peace. So the sheriff is ordered to make Richard, John and John come to Westminster in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February].

[Cross-reference: B248]

B376. Thomas filius Aucheri et Willelmus de Bodyham pro tota communitate patrie de Lossenham et Meyham queruntur quod ubi Riparia de Limene habere solebat cursum suum de latitudine quater viginti pedibus etc. Postea concordati sunt per licenciam etc.

B376. Thomas son of Aucher and William of Bodenham, for the entire community of Lossenham and Maytham, complain that whereas the Lympe River³⁷ used to be eighty feet wide etc. Afterwards, they are agreed by licence etc.

Hundredum de Feleberg'

³⁷Lympne is the old name for the East Rother. E. Ekwall, *English River-Names*, (Oxford, 1928), pp. 243-244.

The Hundred of Felborough

B377. Juratores presentant quod cum due partes istius Hundredi scilicet Chertham et Rodmeresham participare solebant in omnibus cum toto Hundredo et etiam facere consueverunt sectam ad Hundredum de tribus septimanis in tres septimanas, Archiepiscopus Cantuar' et Prior sancte Trinitatis subtraxerunt sectas predictas, nec permittunt homines de predictis villis participare cum predicto Hundredo ut in amerciamentis, finibus (et aliisⁱ) ad dampnum domini regis. [leaves off abruptly]

B377. The jurors present that whereas two parts of this hundred, namely Chartham and Rodmersham, were accustomed to participate in everything with the rest of the hundred and also the [men] were accustomed to make suit to the hundred every three weeks, the archbishop of Canterbury and the prior of Saint Trinity have withdrawn the suits, nor do they allow the men from the villis to participate with the hundred in amercements, fines and other [things] to the king's loss.

B378. Thomas Ode queritur de Waltero de Berghsted' quondam vicecomite quod cum ipse dudum mutuo traxisset iiii^{or} marcas a quodam Vivone judio Cantuar' et inde fecisset cartam suam que reponabatur in Archa Cantuar' ac idem judeus postmodo ob quoddam grave talliagium quod dominus rex assidebat super judeos Cant', subtraxerunt se de predicta villa. Ita quod predictus Walterus (tuncⁱ) temporis vicecomes distrinxisset ipsum pro predictis iiii^{or} marcis et solvendis ad opus domini regis quam eas solvit, predictus Walterus ei reddere noluit cartam predictam. Immo eam reponi fecit in predicta Archa et cum predictus judeus rediisset petiit ab ipso predictas iiii^{or} marcas. Ita quod nullo modo habere potuit predictam cartam antequam fecisset finem cum predicto judeo per L^a solidos de quibus ipse confecit quandam aliam cartam que modo est in Archa predicta, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam [leaves off abruptly]

B378. Thomas Ode complains against Walter of Bursted, once a sheriff, that whereas he recently borrowed 4 marks from Vivian, a jew from Canterbury, and he made him his charter which was deposited in the Canterbury *archa* and [thereafter] on account of the heavy tax which the king levied upon the jews of Canterbury, they left the vill, Walter, then sheriff, distrained him to pay the 4 marks, which he paid to the king's benefit. Thereafter, Walter would not return the charter rather he replaced it in the *archa* and when the jew returned, he sought the 4 marks from him. Thus, he was in no way able to have the charter until he made fine with the jew for 50 shillings for which he made another charter which is now in the *archa*. Wherefore, he says that he has suffered damage to the value of

[Membrane 22d.]

Hundredum de Calehull' in Shrewinghop'

The Hundred of Calehill in [the Lathe of] Shipway Cross

B379. Juratores presentant quod post mortem Ricardi Archiepiscopi Cantuar' dum dominus Rex habuit custodiam Archiepiscopatus vacante sede quidam Ricardus de Lond' tunc ballivus domini regis levavit quandam consuetudinem in isto Hundredo, scilicet quod cepit ad duos Lawedayes per annum vii marcas et viii denarios. Que consuetudines hucusque servabatur in isto Hundredo et quod ballivi istius Archiepiscopi percipiunt annuatim predictos denarios. Ideo inde *loquendum* cu[m] [leaves off]

Iidem presentant quod ballivi predicti Aarchiepiscopi perciperunt fines et amerciamenta de singulis pistoribus et Braciatoribus infra istum Hundredum et nunquam fieri faciunt iudicium de eis. Ideo similiter inde *loquendum*.

B379. The jurors present that after the death of Richard the Archbishop of Canterbury, while the king had custody of the vacant seat of the archbishopric, a certain Richard of London, then

the king's bailiff, raised a certain custom in this hundred, namely he took 7 marks and 8 pence per year from the two lawdays, which custom up to this point is retained in this hundred and the bailiffs of the [present] archbishop collect the aforesaid money yearly. So *it is to be discussed* [with the king].

The same present that the archbishop's bailiffs collected fines and amercements from each baker and brewer within this hundred and they never caused justice to be done concerning them. So likewise *it is to be discussed*.

B380.(Kant') Memorandum quod Willelmus de Disce serviens Gilberti Peche de Westclyve, Ricardus de la Hale, Rogerus filius Johannis le Clerc, Ranulphus de Bere, Johannes Edward de Sculton', Ricardus le Clerk et Gibertus atte Sole manuceperunt habendi predictum Gilbertum Peche coram Justiciario Anglie in Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie apud Lond' ad computandum cum Johanne de Norht' Cive London' de xxiii libris et iii solidis quos idem Gilbertus mutuo recepit a predicto Johanne etc.

B380.(Kent) Memorandum that William of Diss, a serjeant of Gilbert Pecche of West Cliffe, Richard de la Hale, Roger son of John le Clerk, Ranulph of Bere, John Edward of Sculeton, Richard le Clerk and Gilbert atte Soles undertake to have Gilbert Peche before the justiciar of England in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] at London to settle with John of Northampton, a citizen of London, concerning 23 pounds and 3 shillings which Gilbert borrowed from John.

Hundredum de Wych'

The Hundred of Wye

B381. Juratores presentant quod Borga de Tremewurth' (et Crundalⁱ) semper solebant facere sectam ad hundredum de [sic] et reddere ad albam firmam domini regis singulis annis xxiii denarios et in omnibus aliis participare cum eodem Hundredo usque iam octo annis elapsis quod homines predictae Burge subtraxerunt sectam predictam, et etiam predictos denarios de alba firma nec volunt participare in aliquo cum Hundredo sicut solebant. Et quod predictae ville sunt de feodo Glouc'. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

B381. The jurors present that the tithings of Trimworth and Crundale were always accustomed to make suit to the hundred of [Wye] and to render the king's blanch-farm each year at 23 pence and to participate in all else with the hundred, until some eight years ago when the men of the tithings withdrew the suit and also the money concerning the blanch-farm, nor did they wish to participate in anything with the hundred as they were accustomed. Since, the villis are from the fee of Gloucester, so *it is to be discussed*.

B382. Item presentant quod homines Johannis de Crioll' de Asmerfeld' que sequi solebant ad hundredum de Wych' cum Borga de la Tune subtraxerunt se de predicta secta facienda iam decem et octo annis elapsis, scilicet tempore quo Bertramus de Crioll' pater ipsius Johannis fuit vicecomes Kant'. Et super hoc venit predictus Johannes et dicit quod ipsi liberi tenentes sui sunt et quod respondere debeant pro se ipsis. Ideo veniunt predicti homines *crastino*.

B382. They also present that John of Crioil's men from Ashenfield, who were accustomed to make suit to the hundred of Wye along with the tithing of Tune, withdrew themselves from the suit some eighteen years ago, namely during the time when John's father, Bertram of Crioil, was sheriff of Kent. Concerning this, John comes and says that his tenants are free and ought to answer for themselves. So the men shall come on the *morrow*.

Hundredum de Thenham

The Hundred of Teynham

B383. Juratores presentant quod Thomas Abelyn vacante sede Archiepiscopatus Cantuar' post

mortem beati Edmundi quondam Archiepiscopi dum fuit ballivus domini Regis de Tenham cepit singulis annis de qualibet borga dicti Hundredi vi solidos et illam consuetudinem levavit quam consuetudinem (Archiepiscopo^s) qui modo est; adhuc tenet et semper postea tenuit. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

B383. The jurors present that Thomas Aubeney, while he was the king's bailiff of Teynham during the vacancy of the archbishopric of Canterbury after the Blessed Edmund's death, took 6 shillings each year from whichever tithing of the said hundred and he raised that custom, which custom the present archbishop still holds [to] and always afterwards held [to]. So *it is to be discussed*.

B384.(Crastino) Item presentant quod Archiepiscopus capit in manum suam custodias terrarum tenentium suorum in gavelykend' et illas tenet quousque heredes sint xv vel xvi annorum vel eas vendit unde dicunt quod cepit pro custodia terre et heredum Johannis de la Dale C solidos. Et pro custodia terre et heredum Johannis de Fraximo xx solidos. Etiam custodia terre et heredum Willelmi de (^{il})clakefeud' L solidos. Etiam custodia terre et heredum Walteri Tylywe xl solidos. Et sic de multis allis. Ideo plenius inde inquirendo per milites singulorum lestorum eiusdem comitatus etc.

B384.(Morrow) They also present that the archbishop took into his hand the tenures of the lands of his tenants in gavelkind. These he held until the heirs were 25 or 26 years old or he sold them. They say that he took 100 shillings for the custody of the land and heir of John de la Dale, 20 shillings for the custody of the land and heir of John of Fresne, 50 shillings for the custody of the land and heir of William of ([B])lakefield, 40 shillings for the custody of the land and heir of Walter Tilly and just like this for many others. So it is to be fully inquired into by the knights of each lathe from the county.

B385.(T) Juratores presentant quod quotienscumque sit presentatio in comitatu de morte hominis, vicecomes capit amerciamenta pro huiusmodi presentacione que capi non consueverunt a vicecomitibus nisi a tempore Reginaldi de Cobeham qui quondam fuit vicecomes Kant'. Et similiter Archiepiscopus Cantuar' capit huiusmodi amerciamenta de huiusmodi presentacionibus factis de feodo suo que capi non consueverunt nisi tempore Archiepiscopi qui nunc est. Et (quia¹) huiusmodi amerciamenta non debent capi nisi in adventu justiciariorum de assensu domini Regis preceptum est vicecomiti et similiter Archiepiscopo ne decetero capiant huiusmodi amerciamenta etc.

B385.(T) The jurors present that as often as it is presented in this county concerning the dead the sheriff takes amercements for this kind of presentment, which [amercements] were not accustomed to be taken by the sheriffs, except at the time of Reginald of Cobham, who was once sheriff of Kent. Likewise, the archbishop of Canterbury takes this kind of amercement for these kinds of presentments made within his fee, which [amercements] were not accustomed to be taken, except during the present archbishop's time. Since this kind of amercement ought not to be taken except with the king's consent during the coming of the justices, the sheriff, and likewise the archbishop, is ordered henceforward not to take this kind of amercement.

B386. Juratores presentant quod Willelmus de Tytisdene dum fuit ballivus Archiepiscopi Cant' iam tribus annis elapsis levavit quandam consuetudinem in Hundredo de Thenham scilicet quod omnes tenentes predicti Archiepiscopi faciunt (presementa^s) ad quodlibet halmotum que facere non consueverunt, nisi ad unum lagheday per annum ideo predictus Willelmus de Tytisdene in *misericordia*.³⁸ Et prohibitum est ballivis predicti Archiepiscopi ne decetero capiant huiusmodi presentamenta nisi eo modo quo capi consueverunt etc.

B386. The jurors present that William of Tiffenden, while he was the archbishop of Canterbury's bailiff, some three years ago raised a custom in the hundred of Teynham, namely that all the

³⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

archbishop's tenants must make presentments to whichever halmote [pertains to them], which [custom] they were not accustomed to carry out, except at the one lawday per year. So William of Tiffenden [is] in *mercy*. Heneceforward, the archbishop's bailiffs are prohibited from taking this kind of presentment except in the way they were accustomed.

B387. Etiam Henricus de Burne de fine suo pro transgressione-- *xl solidi*³⁹ per plegium Galfridi de Saxlingherst.

B387. Also Henry of Bourne concerning his fine for a transgression-- *40 shillings* by pledge of Geoffrey of Saxlinghurst.

Hundrdum De Boctone

The Hundred of Boughton

B388. Symon filius Ade queritur de Johanne de Rokele quod quidam (Hamo Welydo et quidam alii¹) homines ignoti ex precepto eiusdem Johannis verberaverunt quendam Rogerum Quentyn apud Shelve hominem predictis Symonis et duos equos ipsius Symonis de pretio duarum marcarum abduxerunt et unam mappam de pretio xii^{cim} denariorum asportaverunt et predictos equos et mappam adhuc detinent contra pacem etc. Et hoc idem convictum est per juratam in quam predicti Symom et Johannes (inde¹) se posuerunt. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Johannes satisfaciat eidem Symoni de dampnis suis que taxantur ad xl solidos de predicta verbertura et predictis equis et mappa. Et Johannes in *misericordia*.⁴⁰

B388. Simon son of Adam complains against John of Ruxley that a certain Hamo Welydo and other men of whom he is ignorant, on John's order, beat Simon's man, [one] Roger Quinton at Shelve, abducted two of Simon's horses worth 2 marks and carried off a table cloth worth 12 pence, against the peace. They still detain the horses and the table cloth. This is determined by the jury on which Simon and John placed themselves. So it is adjudged that John shall satisfy Simon of his damages which were assessed at 40 shillings, regarding the beating, the horses and the table-cloth. John [is] in *mercy*.

B389. Convictum est quod cum Abbas de Faveresham levasset quemdam parcum in bosco ipsius Abbatis del Blen ad inparcanda averia in dampno suo inventa et fagotes suos in eodem salvo custodiendos in quo quidam bosco homines de Bocton' solebant communicare pro xi solidis quos predicto Abbati dare consueverunt excepto tempore pessone, Ricardus filius Petri, Normannus Roberti, Johannes Clericus, Kot Bonhumme, Springet Kille, Robertus Derman, Willelmus Myre, Willelmus Drake, Johannes Herding, Willelmus Herding, Eylbodus Attehaleke venerunt ad predictum parcum et antequam perinclusus esset predictum parcum fregerunt et penitus prostraverunt. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus parcus reficiatur in pristum statum ad custum ipsorum et predictum illum perficiat si voluerit et omnes predicti in *misericordia*.⁴¹

B389. It is determined that the abbot of Faversham raised a park in the abbot of Blean's wood to impound beasts found at his loss, and he reserved the custody of his beeches in the wood, in which wood the men from Boughton were accustomed to common, except during the foraging season, for 11 shillings which they were accustomed to give the abbot. Richard son of Peter, Norman Robert, John Clerk, Kot Bonhumme, Springet Kille, Robert Derman, William Mire, William Drake, John Harding, William Harding [and] Eylbodus Attehaleke came to the park and, before it was enclosed, they destroyed it and completely knocked it down. So it is adjudged that the park is to be restored as if new at their cost. The aforesaid [abbot] shall complete it, if he wishes. All the aforesaid [are] in *mercy*.

³⁹Margin note by scribe, xl. s. crossed out.

⁴⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁴¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B390. Hundredum de Bocton' queritur de Henrico Lovel' quod predictus Henricus dum fuit seneschallus Beati Edmundi quondam Archiepiscopi Cant' injuste et per extorsionem cepit de eodem Hundredo ^{iiii^{or}} marcas pro transgressionibus cuiusdam hominis de Dovor'. Et predictus Henricus quesitus quo modo velit se de hoc acquietare, dicit quod revera cepit predictam pecuniam et juste, quia dicit predictum Hundredum tenebitur respondere de catalla cuiusdam Hamonis filii Jocei fugitivi que apreciata fuerit ad ⁱⁱⁱⁱ marcas. Et postea per summonicionem scaccarii que sibi inde venit [et] levavit predictam pecuniam ad opus domini sui Archiepiscopi. Et quod ita sit ponit (seⁱ) super patriam. Juratores dicunt quod predictum Hundredum nunquam recepit aliquem denarium de catalla predicti Hamonis fugitivi, nec quod unquam aliqua summonicio de scaccario venit ad predictum Henricum de predicta pecunia levanda, set dicunt quod per extorsionem et injuste cepit predictam pecuniam, requisiti si recepit ad opus suum proprium vel ad opus Archiepiscopi, dicunt ad opus Archiepiscopi. Et quia predictus Archiepiscopus ([mortuus est]^{il}) consideratum est quod predictus Henricus restituat hominibus predicti hundredi predictas ^{iiii^{or}} marcas. Et sit in *misericordia*.⁴²

B390. The hundred of Boughton complains against Henry Lovel that Henry, while he was the seneschal of the Blessed Edmund once the archbishop of Canterbury, unjustly and by extortion took 4 marks from the hundred for a transgressions against a certain man from Dover. Henry was asked how he wished to acquit himself of this. He says that he took the money and justly so, since the hundred is held to answer for the chattels of Hamo son of Jocus, a fugitive, which [chattels] were valued at 4 marks. Afterwards, by summons from the exchequer, he himself came [and] raised the money for the benefit of his lord the archbishop. On this he places himself on the country. The jurors say that the hundred never received any money from the fugitive Hamo's chattels, nor did any summons to raise the money ever come to Henry from the exchequer. They say that by extortion he unjustly took the money. [The jurors] were asked if he received it for his own benefit or that of the archbishop's benefit; they said to the archbishop's benefit. Whereas, the aforesaid archbishop ([is dead]), so it is adjudged that Henry shall restore the 4 marks to the men of the hundred. He is in *mercy*.

[Membrane 23]

Hundredum De Middelton'

The Hundred of Milton Regis

B391. Juratores presentant quod cum pistorum et braseatorum antiquitus consueverunt subire iudicium pillore et tumbrelli quotiens(cumⁱ)que brascassent vel frumiassent contra assisam. Et modo quotienscumque huiusmodi transgressionem ([fec]^{il})erunt evadunt per amerciamenta et per levem redempcionem. Ita quod non sunt puniti secundum quantitatem delecti nec eo modo quo (puniri^s) debent ad gravem dampnum totius patrie. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti qui ballivus est predicti hundredi quod quotienscumque (deceteroⁱ) contigerit quod aliquis vel aliqua furmat vel brascat contra assisa ipsos iudicium pillore vel tumbrelli subire faciat sine aliqua redempcione ab eis capienda etc. Et si aliquis per hoc noluerit castigari cum sepius huiusmodi iudicium subient, suspendatur ab huiusmodi ministerio ita quod illud amplius in predicto hundredo non exercent etc.

B391. The jurors present that whereas the bakers and brewers in former times were accustomed to suffer judgement in the pillory and tumbrel as often as they brewed or baked against the assize, now as often as they commit these kinds of transgressions they evade [this punishment] by amercements and through light fines. Thus they are neither punished according to the severity of the offence nor in the manner in which they ought to be punished,

⁴²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

to the great loss of the entire country. So the sheriff, who is the bailiff of the aforesaid hundred, is ordered that, henceforward, as often as it happens that someone brews or bakes against the assize he shall place them in the pillory or trumbel without taking any fine from them. If anyone by means of this [punishment] does not wish to be corrected, since they suffer judgement more often, he shall be suspended from this kind of work so that he shall not work in the hundred..

B392. Item iidem iuratores presentant quod cum consuetudo sit per totam Kant' quod quando aliquis obierit quam terram teneat in gavelikende et heres suus sit infra etatem mater vel parens propinquior ipsius heredi ex parte matris habere debet custodiam ipsius heredis et terre sue (ad¹) appruandum et ad respondendum de exitibus eiusdem terre predicto heredi cum ad etatem pervenerit et hoc absque aliquo fine inde capiando nisi tantummodo rationabile relevio secundum consuetudinem Hundredi, ballivi predicti hundredi modo non permittunt quod huiusmodi heredes vel custodes ipsorum saisinam de predictis terris habeant antequam gravem finem capiant de ipsis scilicet de aliquibus xx^{ti} marcis. Et de quibusdam plus et quibusdam minus et hoc a tempore Willelmi le Bretun vicecomiti istius comitatu et ante. Ideo inde *loquendum*.

B392. The same jurors also present that whereas the custom throughout the whole of Kent is that whenever someone dies who held land in gavelkind and their heir is under age, the mother, or the heir's nearest relative on the mother's side, ought to have custody of the heir and his land to profit therefrom and to answer for the outgoing taken from the land to the heir when the heir comes of age. This [should be done] without taking any fine, except only for reasonable relief according to the custom of the hundred. The bailiffs of the hundred at present do not allow heirs of this kind or their guardians to have seisin of the lands before they take a heavy fine from them, namely from some 20 marks and from others more and [from] others less. This [was done] from William le Breton's time as sheriff of this county and before. So *it is to be discussed*.

B393. Convictum est quod Simon Kokel injuste cepit de Willelmo de Hunderdon' xii denarios eo quod predictus Willelmus fodit unam carucatam terre in terra sua propria. Ideo predictus Symon respondeat (^e) de xii denariis⁴³ domino regi eo quod predictus Willelmus non sequitur. Convictum est quod predictus Symon injuste cepit de Willelmo Tulle viii solidos et duos porcos de pretio iiii^{or} solidorum inponens ei quod uxor eiusdem Willelmi braseavit contra assisam que nunquam braseavit. Ideo respondeat predicto Willelmo qui sequitur de xii solidis.

B393. A jury determined that Simon Kokel unjustly took 12 pence from William of Underdown because William dug up one carucate of land on Simon's land. So Simon shall answer to the king for the 12 pence because William has not sued. It is also determined that Simon unjustly took 8 shillings and two pigs worth 4 shillings from William Tilly, alleging that William's wife had brewed against the assize when she had never brewed. So he shall answer to William who sued for the 12 shillings.

B394. Idem cepit de Symone Goldwyne dimidiam marcam inponens ei quod hospitavit latrones quos non hospitavit. Ideo respondeat domino regi de *dimidia marca*,⁴⁴ eo quod predictus Symon non sequitur. Idem cepit injuste de Henrico filio Gunnuldi ii solidos Et de Symone filio Gunnuldi dimidiam marcam, eo quod fecerunt quandam speluncam super terram suam propriam imponens eis quod foderunt super regale chiminum quod non fecerunt. Ideo respondeat domino regi de predicta *dimidia marca* et ii solidis,⁴⁵ eo quod predicti Henricus et Symon non sequuntur. Idem cepit de Radulfo de Hamstede injuste xviii denarios imponens ei quod debuit ipsum defamasse de concubitu cuiusdam mulieris. Ideo respondeat domino regi

⁴³Margin note by scribe, xii. d. crossed out.

⁴⁴Margin note by scribe, di. m. crossed out.

⁴⁵Margin note by scribe, di. m. ii. s. crossed out.

de *xviii denariis*⁴⁶ eo quod Radulfus non sequitur. Convictum est etiam quod cum vicecomes precipisset predicto Symoni ad dandos Ade de Brok' *iii solidos* et Willelmo Golloye *ii solidos* de exitibus Hundredi de Midelton' pro quodam obsequio ei facto, predictus Symon non dum soluit eis predictam pecuniam set eam ad opus suum proprium retinuit. Ideo predictus Symon respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia eo quod non sequuntur.⁴⁷

B394. [The same Simon] took a half mark from Simon Goldwin, alleging that he harboured thieves which he has not [done]. So he shall answer to the king for the *half mark* because Simon has not sued. Simon also unjustly took 2 shillings from Henry son of Gunilda and a half mark from Simon son of Gunilda because they built a covered passage upon their land, alleging that they have dug beneath the royal-way when they have not [done so]. So he shall answer to the king for the *half mark* and 2 *shillings* because Henry and Simon have not sued. Simon also took 18 pence from Ralph of Hampstead, alleging that he accused him of concubinage [with] certain women. So he shall answer to the king for the *18 pence* because Ralph has not sued. It is also determined that whereas the sheriff for a service done on his behalf ordered Simon to give Adam of Brook 3 shillings and William Golloye 2 shillings from the outgoings of the hundred of Milton Regis, Simon has not yet paid them the money, but he kept it for his own benefit. So Simon shall answer to the king for the money, because they have not sued.

B395. Idem cepit injuste de Willelmo Berwe *xii denarios*. Ideo respondeat domino regi *xii denariis*⁴⁸ eo quod Willelmus non sequitur.

B395. [The same Simon] also unjustly took 12 pence from William Barrow. So he shall answer to the king for the *12 pence* because William has not sued.

B396. Idem cepit injuste per pluras particulas et per multimodos extorsiones *xxxviii solidos* et *vi denarios* scilicet de aliquibus eo quod imposuit eis latrocinium de quo non fuerunt culpabiles et quibusdam quod culpabiles fuerunt de Leyrwyt de quo nunquam fuerunt convicti nec in Hundredo nec alibi. Ideo respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia eo quod nullus sequitur.⁴⁹ Et predictus Symon pro multis transgressionibus et extorsionibus committatur *gaole*.⁵⁰ Post venit predictus Simon et finem fecit per *x macras*⁵¹ per plegium Johannis de Tonge et Gervase de Holingeburn'.

B396. [The same Simon], for various items and through numerous extortions, unjustly took 38 shillings and 6 pence, namely concerning some he alleged robbery, of which [allegation] they were not found guilty, and others [he alleged that they] were guilty of 'lairwite', of which [allegation] they were never convicted neither in the hundred nor elsewhere. So he shall answer to the king for the money because no one sued. Simon for the numerous transgressions and extortions is to be committed to *gaol*. Afterwards, Simon came and made fine for 10 pounds, by pledge of John of Tonge and Gervase of Hollingbourne.

B397. Convictum est per juratam in quam Radulfus le Sauvag' se posuit quod cum Johannes Kaym aliquando esset collector in Hundredo de Midelton' ac plenarius respondisset de tota pecunia quam receperat ad opus domini Regis predicto Radulfo qui tunc fuit camerius eiusdem Hundredi, idem Radulfus nichilominus distrixit ipsum ad reddendum *vi solidos vii denarios* de quibusdam tenentibus domini Regis in predicto Hundredo quos idem Johannes distringere non potuit licet idem Johannes prius ostendisse predicto Radulfo quod predictus redditus de predictis tenentibus aretro esset nec idem Radulfus manum apponere voluisset. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Radulfus restituat predicto Johanni predictam pecuniam.

⁴⁶Margin note by scribe, xviii. d. crossed out.

⁴⁷Margin note by scribe, ii. s. iii. s. crossed out.

⁴⁸Margin note by scribe, xii. d. crossed out.

⁴⁹Margin note by scribe, xxxviii. s. vi. d. crossed out.

⁵⁰Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁵¹Margin note by scribe, x. m. crossed out.

Et recuperet versus predictos tenentes etc.

B397. It is determined by the jury on which Ralph le Sauvage placed himself that when John Kaym was the collector in the hundred of Milton Regis and had fully answered for all the money which he had received for the king's benefit to Ralph, who was then the chamberlain of the hundred, he, nonetheless, distrained John to render 6 shillings [and] 7 pence from the king's tenants in the hundred whom John was not able to distrain. Although John had already shown Ralph that the tenants were in arrears for the rent, Ralph did not wish to take action. So it is adjudged that Ralph shall restore the money to John. He shall recover against the tenants.

B398. Agnes de Elimestede queritur de Copino de Elimested' quod predictus Copinus die dominica proxima ante Pascham Floridum anno x^lo venit ad domum ipsius Agnete in Elimested' et insultum fecit in ipsam et ipsam verberavit, vulneravit et maletractavit et x prunaria crescencia super terram ipsius Agnete succidit et asportavit contra pacem etc. unde dicit quod deteriorata est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xx^{ti} solidorum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et Copinus venit et deffendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et bene deffendit quod ipsam non verberavit, nec vulneravit, nec maletractavit nec aliqua prunaria crescencia super terram ipsius Agnete succidit, set dicit quod quedam prunaria crescencia super terram suam propriam succidit et asportavit. Et de hoc ponit se super patriam. Et quia testatum est per juratam de consensu parcium electos quod solum in que dicta prunaria succisa fuerunt est quedam divisa inter terram predictorum Agnete et Copini in qua uterque ipsorum magno tempore clamavit solum. Et quia predicta Agnes non dum disrationavit predictum solum esse suum ideo predictus Copinus inde sine die. Et predicta Agnes in *misericordia*.⁵² Convictum est etiam per eandem juratam quod predictus Copinus percussit predictam Agnetem in capite quadam lusca ideo satisfaciat inde predicta Agnes. Et Copinus in *misericordia*.⁵³

B398. Agnes of Elmstead complains against Copinus of Elmstead that he, on the first Sunday before the Florida of Easter year 40 [9 April 1256], came to Agnes' house in Elmstead and insulted her in her home and beat, wounded and maltreated her and cut down and carried off 10 of Agnes' plum trees growing on her land, against the king's peace. Wherefore, she says that she has suffered damage to the value of 20 shillings. Thereon she produces suit.

Copinus comes and denys force and injury. He readily maintains that he did not beat, wound or maltreat her, nor did he cut down any plum trees growing on her land. But he says that he cut down plum trees growing on his own land and carried them off. On this he places himself on the country. Since it is testified by the jury elected by both parties that the site on which the plum trees were cut is a boundary [area] between Agnes' and Copinus' land [and] each one has claimed the site for a long time, and whereas Agnes' has not yet proved the site to be hers, so Copinus is without a day. Agnes [is] in *mercy*. It is also determined by the jury that Copinus struck Agnes in the eye, so he shall satisfy her. Copinus [is] in *mercy*.

B399. Convictum est per juratam in quam Nicholaus Lovenod se posuit quod idem Nicholaus injuste extorsit de Joceo de la Hethe *iiii solidos*⁵⁴ imponens ei quod debuit percepisse et concelasse wreck' maris de quo non fuit convictus. Ideo respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia eo quod predictus Joceus non sequitur. Et predictus Nicholaus in *misericordia*.⁵⁵

B399. It is determined by the jury on which Nicholas Lovenod placed himself that he extorted 4 *shillings* from Joceus de la Heath, alleging that he collected and concealed wrecks of the sea of which he was not convicted. So Nicholas shall answer to the king for the money because Joceus has not sued. Nicholas [is] in *mercy*.

⁵²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁵⁴Margin note by scribe, iiii. s. crossed out.

⁵⁵Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B400. Convictum est per juratam in quam Thomas le Heam se posuit quod idem Thomas per plures extorsiones cepit de pluribus (per plures extorsiones⁵⁶) et pluras particulas *xix solidos*⁵⁶ imponens cuidam latrocinium de quo redempcionem cepit pro ipso d([imit]il)tendo in pace et imponens quibusdam plures transgressionis de quibusdam non fuerunt convicti. Ideo respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia eo quod nullus sequitur. Et Thomas committatur *gaole*.⁵⁷ Postea [venit et] finem fecit per *xl solidos*⁵⁸ per plegium Henrici de Burdeston' et Bartholomei de Swaneton'.

B400. It is determined by the jury on which Thomas le Heam placed himself that Thomas, by numerous extortions and various items, took *19 shillings* from many [people], accusing one person of robbery from whom he took a fine for dismissing him in peace, and [by] alleging many transgressions concerning which they were not convicted. So he shall answer to the king for the money because no one sued. Thomas is to be committed to *gaol*. Afterwards, [he came and] made fine for *40 shillings* by pledge of Henry of Burdeston and Bartholomew of Swanton.

B401.(+) Convictum est per juratam in quam Thomas Abelyn et Alexanderus de Croft se posuerunt quod cum predictus Alexander teneretur cuidam Copini judeo Lond' in xiiii marcis argenti. Et predictus Copinus perquisisset breve domini Regis vicecomiti Kant' quod levare faceret predictum debitum. Et predictus Alexander dedisset predicto Thome unum bovem per sic quod perquireret ei terminos versus predictum Copinum de predicto debito reddendo. Et predictus Copinus constituisset ei terminos de predicto debito reddendo. Ita quod ad primum terminum reddere debuisset *v^{que}* marcas. Et assignasset predictum Thomam ad recipiendum predictas *v^{que}* marcas, predictus Alexander pacavit predicto Thome predictas *v^{que}* marcas de quibus predictus Thomas ipsum non acquietavit versus predictum judeum. Ita quod predictus judeus (posteaⁱ) fecit predictum Alexanderum distringi pro toto predicto debito. Ita quod predictus Alexander necessitate compulsus postea solvit predicto judeo totum predictum debitum scilicet tam predictas *v^{que}* marcas quas pacavit predicto Thome quam residuum predicti denarii. Set dicunt quod predictus Thomas postea satisfaciat predicto Alexandero de *xl solidis* et retinuit duas marcas de quibus nunquam postea ei satisfaciat ad dampnum ipsius Alexanderi ad valenciam unius marce. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Thomas satisfaciat eidem Alexandero de predictis duabus marcis et de dampnis suis que taxantur ad *i marcem*. Et predictus Thomas in *misericordia*.⁵⁹

B401.(+) It is determined by the jury on which Thomas Aubeney and Alexander of Croft placed themselves that whereas Alexander is held to Copinus, a jew of London, in 14 silver marks and Copinus obtained a writ directing the sheriff of Kent to raise the debt, Alexander gave Thomas one ox on condition that he obtain terms with Copinus concerning the debt. Copinus arranged terms for the payment of the debt. Thus, at the first term Alexander ought to render 5 marks. Copinus assinged Thomas to collect the 5 marks [and] Alexander paid Thomas the 5 marks concerning which Thomas did not acquit him against the jew. Thus, the jew distrained Alexander for the whole debt. Thus, Alexander was forced to pay the jew the whole debt, namely the 5 marks which he paid Thomas as well as the rest of the money. But, they say that Thomas later satisfied Alexander of 40 shillings and withheld two marks of which he never satisfied him, to Alexander's loss of one mark. So it is adjudged that Thomas shall satisfy Alexander of the two marks and of his damages which were assessed at 1 mark. Thomas [is] in *mercy*.

B402. Rogerus Wynter cognoscit quod (debetⁱ) Wyltino Pynewygge et Osberto filio eius *xx solidos* (pro dampnis suis de transgressionis ei factaⁱ) de quibus ei reddet medietatem ad

⁵⁶Margin note by scribe, *xix. s.* crossed out.

⁵⁷Margin note by scribe, *Gaol.* crossed out.

⁵⁸Margin note by scribe, *xl. s.* crossed out.

⁵⁹Margin note by scribe, *mia'* crossed out.

Pascha anno xliii. Et alteram medietatem ad festum sancti Michaelis proximo sequens. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

B402. Roger Winter acknowledges that he owes Wilton Pynewygge and Osbert his son 20 shillings for damages done to them, concerning which [money] he shall render half at Easter year 43 [13 April 1259] and the other half at the following feast of Saint Michael [29 September]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

B403. Petrus Dodeman cognoscit quod debet Gilberto de Roff' Draper' iiii^{or} marcas argenti unde reddet ei medietatem ad festum omnium sanctorum anno xliiii. Et alteram medietatem ad Pascha proxime sequens. Et nisi fecerit; concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc. Et custum et dampna etc. Et sciendum quod pro predictis iiii^{or} marcis remisit et quietumclamavit predictus Gilbertus de se et heredibus suis totum jus etc. quod habuit exigendi a predicto Petro aliquam aliam pecuniam usque ad diem veneris proximam post festum sancti Vincenti anno xliii. Et similiter omnia dampna que habuit occasione detentionis alicuius pecunie usque ad predictum diem.

B403. Peter Dodman acknowledges that he owes Gilbert of Rochester a draper 4 silver marks. Wherefore, he shall render half at the feast of All Saints year 44 [1 November 1259] and the other half at the following Easter [4 April 1260]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands and at his cost and loss. It is known that for the 4 marks Gilbert remitted and quitclaimed himself and his heirs of all right [and claim] which he had in demanding any other money from Peter until the first Friday after the feast of Saint Vincent year 43 [24 January 1259]. Likewise [he quitclaimed himself], of all damage [and] any money which he had on the occasion of the withholding until the aforesaid day.

B404. Rogerus (Wynterⁱ) cognoscit quod debet Johanni del Hul i marcam occasione transgressionis ei facte unde reddet ei medietatem ad Purificacionem beate Marie anno xliii. Et alteram medietatem ad Pascha proximo sequens. Et nisi fecerit, concedit quod vicecomes faciat de terris etc.

B404. Roger Winter acknowledges that he owes John del Hull 1 mark for a transgression done to him. Wherefore, he shall render half at the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 43 [2 February 1259] and the other half at the following Easter [13 April]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his lands.

B405. Idem Rogerus cognoscit quod debet Waltero Abbot ii solidos quos ei reddet ad inicpium quadragessimo anno xliii. Et nisi fecerit; concedit ut supra.

B405. The same Roger acknowledges that he owes Walter Abbot 2 shillings which he shall render at the beginning of Lent year 43 [2 March 1259]. If he does not, he grants the same as above.

[Membrane 23d.]

Adhuc De Hundredo De Midelton'

Still Concerning the Hundred of Milton Regis

B406. Henricus le Vineter in *misericordia*⁶⁰ pro transgressionem etc.

B406. Henry the Vintner [is] in *mercy* for a transgression.

B407. Elyas Tony queritur de Lucia que fuit uxor Rogeri de Fogheleston' quod cum predictus Rogerus vir suus dimisisset eidem Elye unum molendinum cum pertinenciis in Sadingeburne

⁶⁰Margin note by scribe, *mia* crossed out.

tenendum ad terminum xii^{cim} annorum et dimidie termino incipiente ad Nativitatem sancti Johannis Baptiste anno xxxix et inde exstitisset in saisina ex dimissione predicti Rogeri per duos annos et amplius predicta Lucia ad festum sancti Michaelis anno xlii eiecit ipsum de predicto molendino unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam C solidorum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et Lucia venit et deffendit vim et injuriam quando etc. [leaves off abruptly]

B407. Ellis Tony complains of Lucy who was the wife of Roger of Folkeston that whereas Roger her husband demised one mill in Sittingbourne to Ellis to hold for the term of twelve and a half years beginning at the Nativity of Saint John the Baptist year 39 [24 June 1255], and he stood in seisin through Roger's demise for two years and more, Lucy, at the feast of Saint Michael year 42 [29 September 1258], ejected him from the mill. Wherefore, he says he has suffered damage to the value of 100 shillings. Thereon he produces suit.

Lucy comes and denys force and injury.

B408. Convictum est per juratam in quam Johannes de Northwode se posuit quod cum quidam Johannes de Wardone clericus tempore quo predictus Johannes de Northwode fuit ballivus de Hundredo de Midelton' posuisset tres oves in quadam pastura communi toti patrie sub custodia cuiusdam pastoris, ac idem pastor postea reddidisset ei predictas oves, predictus Johannes de Northwode imposuit ei quod cepit unam ovem plusquam oves suas proprias. Et attachiavit ipsum veniendi coram ipso ad Hundredum. Et ibi fecit quandam inquisitionem de predicta bidente per quam inquisitionem predictus Johannes de Wardon' acquietatus fuit de predicta bidente. Et nichilominus predictus Johannes de Northwode minatus fuit ei ad (ipsum¹) imprisonandum. Ita quod predictus Johannes de Wardone finem fecit cum ipso pro duabus marcis et dimidia ne imprisonaretur. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Johannes de Northwode satisfaciatur ei de predicta pecunia et de dampnis suis que tanxantur ad ii marcars et dimidiam per juratam. Et predictus Johannes de Northwode committatur *gaole*.⁶¹

Convictum est per easdem juratores quod predictus Johannes de Northwode dum fuit ballivus predicti Hundredi cepit de quampluribus hominibus per diversis extorsionis et injurias *quinque libras, iii^{or} solidos et viii^{to} denarios*.⁶² Et quia nullus sequitur consideratum est quod restituat domino regi predictam pecuniam etc. Et committatur *gaole*⁶³ pro transgressione etc.

Convictum est per eandam juratam quod predictus Johannes dum fuit ballivus injuste et per extorsionem cepit de Willelmo de Molendino *v^{que} quarteria salis que appreciantur ad dimidiam marcarn*. Ideo respondeat predicto Willelmo qui sequitur de predicto pretio etc. Et predictus Johannes pro transgressione committatur *gaole*⁶⁴ etc. Post venit predictus Johannes de Northwode et finem fecit pro omnibus extorsionibus et transgressionibus per *C solidos*⁶⁵ per plegium Rogeri de Northwode etc.

B408. It is determined by the jury on which John of Northwood placed himself that when John of Warden a clerk, during the time when John of Northwood was the bailiff of the hundred of Milton Regis, placed three sheep in the common pasture of the country under the care of certain shepherd, and the shepherd returned the sheep to him, John of Northwood alleged that he took one more sheep beyond his own. John attached him to come before him at the hundred. There he made an inquiry concerning the sheep, by which inquiry John of Warden was acquitted. Nonetheless, John of Northwood threatened to imprison him. Thus, John of Warden made a fine with him for two and a half marks [in order] not to be imprisoned. So it is adjudged that John of Northwood shall satisfy him of the money and for his damages which were assessed by the jury at two and a half marks. John of Northwood is to be committed to

⁶¹Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁶²Margin note by scribe, *v^{que} libr. iii^{or} sl. viii. d.* crossed out.

⁶³Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁶⁴Margin note by scribe, Gaol. crossed out.

⁶⁵Margin note by scribe, c. s. crossed out.

gaol.

It is also determined by the same jurors that John of Northwood, while he was the bailiff of this hundred, took *five pounds, 4 shillings and 8 pence* from numerous men by various extortions and injuries. Since no one sued, it is adjudged that he restore the money to the king. He is to be committed to *gaol* for the transgression.

It is determined by the same jury that John, while he was bailiff, unjustly and through extortions took 5 quarters of salt, which were valued at a half mark, from William of Mill. So he shall answer to William who sued concerning the amount. John is to be committed to *gaol* for the transgression. Afterwards, John came and made fine for *100 shillings* for all the extortions and transgressions by pledge of Roger of Northwood.

B409. Adam Goldring' in *misericordia*⁶⁶ pro falso clamore versus Rogerum Wynter etc.

B409. Adam Goldringer [is] in *mercy* for false claim against Roger Winter.

B410. Convictum est per juratam in quam Rogerus Wynter se posuit quod injuste et per extorsionem cepit de quibusdam hominibus *v^{que} solidos pro amerciamentis ubi non debuit recepisse nisi ii solidos et vi denarios.*⁶⁷ Ideo in *misericordia*⁶⁸ et respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia etc.

B410. It is determined by the jury on which Roger Winter placed himself that he unjustly and by extortion took 5 shillings from certain men for amercements, when he ought not to have taken but 2 *shillings and 6 pence*. So he [is] in *mercy* and shall answer to the king concerning the money.

B411. Convictum est per juratam in quam Hamo Cluut se posuit quod predictus Hamo per plures extorsiones cepit de pluribus injuste *vii solidos, vi denarios.*⁶⁹ Ideo predictus Hamo respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia eo quod nullus sequitur. Et predictus Hamo in *misericordia*.⁷⁰

B411. It is determined by the jury on which Hamo Clout placed himself that Hamo through numerous extortions took *7 shillings [and] 6 pence* from many people. So Hamo shall answer to the king concerning the money because no one sued. Hamo [is] in *mercy*.

B412. Convictum est per juratam in quam Phillipus Kaym se posuit quod predictus Phillipus per plures extorsiones cepit injuste de pluribus *xii solidos.*⁷¹ Ideo respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia eo quod nullus sequitur. Et Phillipus in *misericordia*⁷² plegii de *misericordia* Nicholaus Levenoth [et] Saerus filius Aluredi.

B412. It is determined by the jury on which Philip Kaym placed himself that Philip through numerous extortions unjustly took *12 pence* from many people. So he shall answer to the king concerning the money because no one sued. Philip [is] in *mercy*. The pledges concerning the amercement [are] Nicholas Lennox [and] Saier son of Alfred.

B413. Convictum est per juratam in quam Brisius de la Gare se posuit quod predictus Brisius per plures extorsiones et injuste cepit de pluribus *iiii solidos, vii denarios.*⁷³ Ideo predictus Brisius respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia quia nullus sequitur. Et Brisius in

⁶⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁶⁷Margin note by scribe, ii. s. vi. d. crossed out.

⁶⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁶⁹Margin note by scribe, vii. s. vi. d. crossed out.

⁷⁰Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷¹Margin note by scribe, xii. s. crossed out.

⁷²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷³Margin note by scribe, iii. s. vii. d. crossed out.

misericordia.⁷⁴

- B413. It is determined by the jury on which Brice de la Gare placed himself that Brice through numerous extortions unjustly took 4 *shillings* [and] 7 *pence* from many people. So Brice shall answer to the king concerning the money since no one sued. Brice [is] in *mercy*.
- B414. Convictum est per juratam in quam Jordanus Kaym se posuit quod predictus Jordanus per plures extorsiones cepit injuste de quamluribus *iii solidos*.⁷⁵ Ideo respondeat domino regi de predicta pecunia quia nullus sequitur. Et Jordinus in *misericordia*⁷⁶ plegii de misericordia Nicholaus Levenoth et Johannes Sybeling'.
- B414. It is determined by the jury on which Jordan Kaym placed himself that Jordan through numerous extortions unjustly took 3 *shillings* from many people. So he shall answer to the king concerning the money since no one sued. Jordan [is] in *mercy*. The pledges of the amercement [are] Nicholas Lennox and John Sibeling.
- B415. Convictum est per juratam in quam Nigellus clericus se posuit quod predictus Nigellus per plures extorsiones injuste cepit de quamluribus *v solidos*.⁷⁷ Ideo respondeat domino Regi de predicta pecunia quia nullus sequitur et idem Nigellus in *misericordia*. Et convictum est quod injuste cepit de Alano de Pyrye *v solidos*. Ideo respondeat ei de *v solidis* eo quod sequitur. Et de Radulfo Cornfed' *xii* [denarios]. Ideo respondeat ei de *xii denariis*. Et Nigellus in *misericordia*.⁷⁸ Et testatum est quod omnibus aliis ad ballivam suam pertinentibus fideliter et bene se gessit.
- B415. It is determined by the jury on which Nigel a clerk placed himself that Nigel through numerous extortions unjustly took 5 *shillings* from many people. So he shall answer to the king concerning the money since no one sued. Nigel [is] in *mercy*. It is [also] determined that he unjustly took 5 shillings from Alan of Pirie. So he shall answer to him concerning the five shillings because he sued. [Nigel also took] 12 pence from Ralph Cornfield. So he shall answer to him concerning the 12 pence. Nigel [is] in *mercy*. It is testified that to all the others belonging to his bailiwick he behaved himself faithfully and well.
- B416. Johannes de Northwode cognoscit quod debet Juliane que fuit uxor Johannis de Trikindon' *iiii solidos* quos ei reddet circa Purificacionem beate Marie anno *xliii*. Et nisi fecerit concedit quod vicecomes faciat etc. Et remittit omnes contentiones etc.
- B416. John of Northwood acknowledges that he owes Juliana who was the wife of John of Trikindon' 4 shillings which he shall render around the Purification of the Blessed Mary year 43 [2 February 1259]. If he does not, he grants that the sheriff may levy the amount from his land. He renounces all disputes.
- B417. Alanus de Pyrye in *misericordia*⁷⁹ pro transgressionem etc.
- B417. Alan of Pirie [is] in *mercy* for a transgression.
- B418. Convictum est per juratam in quam Godefridus de Hottebyr' se posuit quod injuste cepit de Borgha de Milstede *xiiii solidos* plusquam (talliagium ad quodⁱ) talliati fuerunt. Ideo restituat hominibus de predicta Borgha qui sequuntur predictam pecuniam. Et quia testatum est quod predictus Godefridus alias pro eadem extorsiones amerciatus fuit coram vicecomite

⁷⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷⁵Margin note by scribe, iii. s. crossed out.

⁷⁶Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷⁷Margin note by scribe, v. s. crossed out.

⁷⁸Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁷⁹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

ideo nichil de misericordia eius.

B418. It is determined by the jury on which Godfrey of Hottebury placed himself that he unjustly took 14 shillings from the tithing of Milsted, this amount was] more than the tallage at which they were tallaged. So he shall restore the money to the men of the tithing who sued. Since it is testified that Godfrey was amerced elsewhere before the sheriff for the same extortion, so his amercement [is] void.

B419. Convictum est per juratam in quam Jacobus de Elmested' se posuit quod idem Jacobus injuste cepit de hominibus de Borgha de Hyldeston' iii solidos plusquam talliagium ad quod talliati fuerunt. Ideo respondeat predictis hominibus qui sequuntur de predicta pecunia.

B419. It is determined by the jury on which James of Elmstead placed himself that James unjustly took 3 shillings from the men of the tithing of Hyldeston [this amount was] more than the tallage at which they were tallaged at. So he shall answer to the men who sued concerning the money.

B420. Convictum est etiam quod idem Jacobus per falsas litteras inplacitavit Johannem Kaym in curia Chistianitatis apud Gyppewyk' de laicis catallis suis. Ita quod antequam cessare voluit de predicto placito sequendo fecit finem cum ipso pro i marca quam ei pacavit. Ideo consideratum est quod respondeat ei de predicta pecunia. Et de dampnis que habuit occasione dicti placiti que taxantur per juratam ad dimidiam marcam. Convictum est etiam quod per extorsionem (et distrincionem⁸⁰) cepit de eodem Johanne Kaym dimidiam marcam. Ideo satisfacciat ei de predicta dimidia marca. Convictum est etiam quod idem Jacobus per plures extortiones et districciones cepit de quampluribus hominibus qui non sequuntur x solidos.⁸⁰ Ideo respondeat inde domino regi. Et sit in misericordia.⁸¹

B420. It is also determined that the same James by false letters pleaded John Kaym concerning his lay chattels in court-Christian at Ipswich. Thus, before James would terminate the plea John made a fine with him for 1 mark which he paid. So it is adjudged that James shall answer to him concerning the money and for the damages which he had on the occasion of the said plea, which were assessed by the jury at a half mark. It is also determined that by extortion and distraint James took a half mark from John Kaym. So James shall satisfy him of the half mark. It is also determined that James, through numerous extortions and distrains, took 10 shillings from many men who have not sued. So he shall answer to the king. He is in mercy.

[Membrane 24]

Adhuc de Middelton'

Still Concerning the Hundred of Milton Regis

B421.(+, adventus justiciarii) Preceptum fuit vicecomiti quod venire faceret hic Petrum de Rocheford' Capellanum (de Snodelond'ⁱ) ad respondendum Willelmo Hughelot, Ricardo de la Broke, Galfrido le Tanur, Matheo Clyper, Agnete que fuit uxor Gilberti de Werme, Ricardo de Porta parti, Galfrido de la Burne (etⁱ) Radulfo Leverich' de placito transgressionis de qua predicti Willelmus et alii queruntur ----- . Et vicecomes nichil inde fecit. Et testatum est quod predictus Petrus clericus est et non habet laicum feodum per quod etc. Et ideo (mandatum estⁱ) officio Roff' Episcopo quod venire faciat eum coram H. le Bygod in proximo adventu etc.

B421.(+, coming of the justiciar) The sheriff was ordered to make come here Peter of Rochester the chaplain of Snodland to answer William Howletts, Richard de la Brook, Geoffrey le

⁸⁰Margin note by scribe, x. s. crossed out.

⁸¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

Tanner, Matthew Clipper, Agnes who was the wife of Gilbert of Worm Hills, Richard of Little Port, Geoffrey de la Bourne and Ralph Levericks concerning a plea of trespass about which William and the others complain.----- The sheriff thereafter did nothing. It is testified that Peter is a clerk and does not have a lay fee through which [he can be distrained]. So an official of the bishop of Rochester is ordered to make him come before [Hugh] Bigod at his next coming.

B422. Johannes de Rokele summonitus fuit ad respondendum Symoni filii Ade de placito quod reddat ei custodiam terre et heredum Ricardi de Rokele et Matilde uxoris eius que ad eum pertinet eo quod predicti Ricardus et Matilda terram suam de eo tenuerunt per servitium militare etc. Et unde predictus Symon per attornatum suum queritur quod cum predicti Ricardus et Matilda tenuerunt de eo unum carucatam terre cum pertinenciis in Schelve, Haggelinden' et Rughele et Tylthe et Vilecumbe et Reytone per servitium feodi unius militis predictus Johannes post mortem predictorum Ricardi et Matilde deforciavit ei custodiam predictae terre Et Robertum filium et heredem eorundem unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad valenciam xl marcarum. Et inde producit sectam etc.

Et Johannes venit et deffendit vim et injuriam quando etc. Et dicit quod nichil clamat in predicta terra nomine custodie nec etiam in corpore predicti Roberti quia bene cognoscit quod predictus Ricardus pater suus cuius heres ipse est aliquo tempore tenuit predictam terram de predicto Symone per predictum servitium. Et dicit quod post mortem ipsius Ricardi successit ipse in predicta terra tamquam filius suus antenatus et heres ipsius Ricardi unde dicit quod predictus Symon nichil clamare potest ei in eadem terra nomine custodie cum predicto Roberto eo quod idem Robertus non est heres predicti Ricardi etc.

Et Symon per attornatum suum dicit quod predictus Johannes nullo modo potest esse heres predicti Ricardi quo ad predictam terram. Dicit enim quod ipse aliquo tempore feofavit predictos Ricardum et Matildam uxorem eius conjunctum de predicta terra tenenda eidem (Roberto^s) et Matilde et heredibus quos idem (Robertus^s) de predicta Matilda procreavit. Et postmodum ut predictum feofamentum maiorem optiniret vigorem; implacitaverunt iidem Ricardus et Matilda ipsum Symonem per breve warante carte. Ita quod finis factis fuit inter eos de predicta terra in curia regis apud Westmonasterium coram S. de Walton' et sociis suis per quem convenit inter eos quod predictus Symon concessit eis predictam terram in escambio pro quibusdam aliis terris et tenementis in Comitatu Essex' tenendam eisdem Ricardo et Matilde et heredibus quos idem Ricardus de predicta Matilda procreavit per servitium feodi unius militis. Et profert quoddam cyrographium inde inter eos confectum quod predictum finem testatur etc.

Et Johannes dicit quod predictus Ricardus pater eius ante confeccionem predicti finis et antequam predictam Matildam desponsaverat feoffatus fuit de predicta terra sumpliciter sibi et heredibus suis et inde fuit in continua seisina tota vita sua absque hoc quod statum suum unquam mutasset. Et quod ita sit paratus est verificare per patriam etc.

Dies datus est eis in Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie apud Westmonasterium preceparcium etc. Postea ad diem illum venit predictus Johannes et optulit se iiii¹⁰ die versus predictum Simonem. Et ipse non venit etc. Et fuit querens. Ideo predictus Johannes inde sine die. Et Simo et plegii sui de prosequendo in *miserecordia*.⁸² Querantur nomina plegiorum

B422. John of Ruxley was summoned to answer Simon son of Adam concerning a plea that John render him the custody of the land and heir of Richard Ruxley and Matilda his wife, which pertains to him because Richard and Matilda held their land of him by military service. Simon, through his attorney, complains that whereas Richard and Matilda held one carucate of land of him in Shelve, Hazelden, Rowley, Tylthe, Welcumeweys and Royton by service of one knight, John, after Richard's and Matilda's death, deforced him of the custody of the land and of Robert their son and heir. Wherefore he says that he has suffered damage to the value of 40 marks. Thereon he produces suit.

John comes and denys force and injury. He says that he neither claims the land in the name of custody nor Robert's body, since he readily acknowledges that Richard, his father

⁸²Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

whose heir he is, once held the land of Simon by the aforesaid service. He says that, after Richard's death, he succeeded to the land as Richard's first born son and heir. Wherefore, he says that Simon is able to claim nothing in the land in the name of custody with Robert, because Robert is not Richard's heir.

Simon, through his attorney, says that as regards the land John is in no way able to be Richard's heir. He says that he once jointly enfeoffed Richard and Matilda of the land for [Richard] and Matilda and the heirs which [Richard] begat of Matilda to hold. Afterwards, in order that the enfeoffment might gain more strength, Richard and Matilda pleaded Simon by writ of warranty of charter. Thus, there was an agreement made between them concerning the land at the king's court at Westminster before S[imon] of Walton and his colleagues. By that agreement, Simon, in exchange for other lands and tenements in the county of Essex, granted the aforesaid land to Richard and Matilda and the heirs which Richard begat of Matilda to hold by service of one knight. He produced a chirograph made between them which testifies to the agreement.

John says that Richard, before he made the agreement and before he married Matilda, was plainly enfeoffed of the land for himself and his heirs and was in continual seisin throughout his lifetime, without this position ever changing. This he stands ready to prove by the country.

A day is given them, by the prayers of both parties, in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] at Westminster. Afterwards, on that day John came and put in an appearance on the fourth day against Simon. Simon did not come. He was the plaintiff. So John is without a day. Simon and his pledges [are] in *mercy*. The names of the pledges are to be examined into[.]

[Cross-reference: B268]

B423. Henricus de la Gare et Stephanus de Froghull' et Robertus Doye in *misericordia*⁸³ pro pluribus transgressionibus et injustis prisus dum fuerunt ballivi Hundredi de Middleton'.

B423. Henry de la Gare, Stephen of Frognall and Robert Doye [are] in *mercy* for numerous transgressions and unjust prizes [taken] while they were bailiffs of the hundred of Milton Regis.

B424. Juratores presentant quod Thomas Albelyn et Isolda uxor eius postquam eam desponsavit subtraxerunt partem suam de Borgha de Bynee et Moriston' iam sexdecim annis elapsis. Ita quod ubi solebant scotiare et lotiare in omnibus cum predicta Borge; predicti Thomas et Isolda a predicto tempore non permiserunt homines suos in predictis villis participare cum predicta Borge sicut facere consueverunt. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat eos de cetero ad scotiandum etc. Et predicti Thomas et Isolda summoneantur quod veniat inde responsuri etc. Post venit predictus Thomas et bene defendit quod nunquam subtraxit predictos tenentos suos de predictis consuetudinibus faciendis. Et de hoc ponit se super juratam. Et juratores dicunt quod predicti homines subtraxerunt se modo predicto (ad dampnum predictae borge dimidie marceⁱ) et hoc per predictum Thomam. Et ideo consideratum est quod predictus Thomas restituat eidem Borge predictam dimidiam marcam. Et sit in *misericordia*⁸⁴ pro transgressionem.

B424. The jurors present that Thomas Aubeney and Isolda his wife, after he had married her, withdrew their share from the tithings of Binney and Moriston, some sixteen years ago. Thus, whereas they were accustomed to pay scot and lot in everything [along] with the tithings, Thomas and Isolda from that time on did not allow their men in those villis to participate with the tithings as they were accustomed [to do]. So the sheriff is ordered that, henceforward, he distrain them to scot. Thomas and Isolda were summoned to come to answer. Afterwards, Thomas came and readily maintained that he never withdrew his tenants from the customs. On this he places himself on the jury. The jurors say that the men withdrew themselves in the manner stated to the tithings' loss of a half mark, and this [was done] by Thomas. So it is

⁸³Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

⁸⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

adjudged that Thomas shall restore the half mark to the tithing. He is in *mercy* for the transgression.

B425. Item presentant quod tenentes Willelmi de Cobeham de Middelton' de feodo

Hospitaliorum subtraxerunt se de scottis et lottis cum Borga de Middelton' cum qua scotiare solebant etc. iam octo annis elapsis. Et super hoc veniunt homines predicti Willelmi et bene defendunt quod ipsi non (subtrahunt^s) de predictis, quia dicunt quod in ultimo itinere G. de Preston' et sociorum suorum justiciariorum in comitatu isto responderunt ipsi predicto Willelmo domino suo de parte sua ipsos contingente de scottis et lottis de itinere illo. Et super hoc veniunt predicti hospitalarii et dicunt quod singuli tenentes de feodo suis quieti sunt de omnimodis scottis et lottis per cartam domini regis nunc, quam proferunt. (Etⁱ) in qua continetur quod predicti hospitalarii et homines sui liberi sunt ab omni scotto et geldo et omnibus auxiliis etc. Et hec carta confecta fuit eis anno xi. Et quia tam (convictum estⁱ) per cognitionem predictorum hominum predicti Willelmi quam per predictos juratores quod predicti homines tempore confeccionis predictae carte et semper postea scotiare solebant et lottare in omnibus cum predicta Borga, usque iam octo annis elapsis quod predicti hospitalarii (auctoritate propriaⁱ) non permiserant ipsos scottare etc. preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat eos de cetero ad scotandum et lotiandum in omnibus cum predicta Borga etc.

Post veniunt predicti hospitalarii et proferunt quandam aliam cartam eiusdem domini regis confectam anno xxxvii per quam eis concessit quod ipsi et homines sui liberi sint ab omni scotto et geldo, et de shyris, hundredis et placitis etc. Et ipsi quesiti si ipsi adeo bene subtraxerunt predictos homines predicti Willelmi quam alios tenentes suos in capite per cartam predictam per quam asserunt se a predicta secta esse quietos; dicunt quod sic. Postea datus est eis dies a die Pasche in xv dies coram Rege, ubicumque etc. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod distrincionem supra dictam interim poni faciat in respectum etc. Et tunc veniunt predicti hospitalarii et ibi habeant cartam predictam etc.

B425. They also present that William of Cobham's tenants of Milton Regis from the fee of the hospitallers withdrew themselves, some eight years ago, from scot and lot with the tithing of Milton Regis, whereas they were accustomed [to scot and lot]. Concerning this, William's men come and readily maintain that they did not withdraw from the aforesaid since they say that in the last eyre of [Gilbert] de Preston and his colleagues, justices [itinerant] in this county, they answered to William their lord concerning their part of the scot and lot from that eyre. Concerning this, the hospitallers come and say that each tenant from their fee is quit of all scot and lot by charter of the present king, which they produced, in which [charter] is contained [the liberty] that the hospitallers and all their men are free from all scot, geld and all aids. This charter was conferred to them in the year 11 [1226-1227]. Since it is determined, through the admission of William's men as well as by the jurors that the men at the time when the charter was conferred and afterwards were always accustomed to pay scot and lot in all [matters] with the tithing until eight years ago when the hospitallers on their own authority did not allow them to scot, the sheriff is ordered that, henceforward, he distrain them for scot and lot in all [matters] with the tithing.

Afterwards, the hospitallers came and produced another charter drafted in the king's name in the year 37 [1252-53], by which he granted them that they and their men were free from all scot, geld, shires, hundreds and suits. They were asked if they truly withdrew William's men as well as their other tenants in chief by the charter, through which they claim to be quit from the suits. They said yes. Afterwards, a day is given them fifteen days from Easter before the king wherever [he shall be]. The sheriff is ordered that in the meantime the distraint, mentioned above, is to be placed in respite. Thereafter the hospitallers have come. They may have the aforesaid charter.

B426. Juratores presentant quod Hospitalarii sancti Johannis Jerlum' leveverunt quandam barreram ex transverso chimini regalis quod ducit de Middleton' usque Sithingeburn' ad nocumentum totius patrie, iam quindecim annis elapsis. Et predicti hospitalarii veniunt et dicunt quod predictum chiminum non est via regalis, immo quedam via facta in solo suo proprio ex gracia et permissione ipsorum a modico tempore transacto, et quod ad commodum patrie est quod predicta barrera remaneat ad impediendum caretas etc. Et quod ita sit ponunt se super patriam. Et juratores super hoc quesiti dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictum chiminum fuit chiminum regale a conquestu Anglie eundi eques et cum carris et caretis usque ad predictum tempus quando dicti hospitalarii levaverunt predictam barreram quominus homines de patria ibidem habere possunt chiminum et chachiam suam cum averiis suis sicut solebant. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod aperiri faciat chiminum illud et predictam barreram amoveri quantum fuerit ad nocumentum etc. Et p [leaves off abruptly]

B426. The jurors present that, some fifteen years ago, the Hospitallers of Saint John of Jerusalem raised a barrier across the royal way which led from Milton Regis to Sittingbourne to the nuisance of the entire country. The hospitallers come and say that the way is not a royal way, rather [it is] a way made on their own site at their grace and permission a short while ago and it is to the advantage of the country that the barrier remains to obstruct carts. On this they place themselves on the country. The jurors were questioned on this. They say upon their oath that the way was a royal one to come and go with horses, carts and hand carts from the time of the conquest of England up to the time when the hospitallers raised the barrier by which the men of the country were not able to use the way and chase their beasts as they were accustomed. So the sheriff is ordered to open that way and to remove the barrier in as much as it was a nuisance. And

B427.(+) Convictum est per juratam in quam Kopinus de Elmested' se posuit quod idem Kopinus injuste distrinxit Ricardum filium Matilde per attilium navis sue eo quod noluit assentire quod perciperet de tenentibus de Middleton' ii solidos ultra talliagium super eos assessum ad opus suum proprium, ad dampnum ipsius Ricardi xx solidos. Ideo satisfaciat ei de predictis xx solidis. Et sit in *miserecordia*¹ pro transgressione. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod de terris et catallis ipsius Copini feiri faciat predictos denarios et illos sine dilatione habere faciat predicto Ricardo, eo quod idem Ricardus inde sequebatur etc.

B427.(+) It is determined by the jury on which Copinus of Elmstead placed himself that he unjustly distrained Richard son of Matilda through his nautical equipment, to Richard's loss of 20 shillings, because Richard did not agree to collect 2 shillings, for Copinus' benefit, beyond the approved tax on the tenants of Milton Regis. So Copinus shall satisfy him of the 20 shillings. Copinus is in *mercy* for the transgression. The sheriff is ordered to levy the money from Copinus' lands and chattels and to make Richard have [the money] without delay, because Richard has sued.

B428.(Kant') Preceptum fuit vicecomitati quod distringeret Willelmum le Breton' per terras etc. quod esset ad hunc diem ad respondendum Thome de Hegham, Bartholomeo, Jordani et Roberto participiis ipsius Thome de quadam transgressione unde iidem Thomas et alii participii sui queruntur de eodem Willelmo. Et Willmus non venit. Et super hoc venerunt Thomas Albelyn, Vytalis le Breton', Willelmus de Aggevill' et Johannes de Fughelston' et manuceperunt habendi eum in Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie apud Westmonasterium eo quod idem Willelmus est in partibus remotis, ad respondendum predictis Thome et aliis de transgressione predicta etc. Idem dies datus est predictis Thome et aliis in Banco. Et predicti Bartholomeus et alii ponunt loco suo predictum Thomam. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod distrincionem quam fecerat super eundem Willelmum occasione predicta; interim remisit etc.

B428.(Kent) The sheriff was ordered to distrain William le Breton through [his] lands to be here on this day to answer Thomas of Higham, Bartholomew, Jordan and Robert, Thomas'

¹Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

participants, concerning a transgression. Thomas and his other participants complain against William. William has not come. Concerning this, Thomas Aubeney, Vitalis le Breton, William of Aggevell and John of Folkestone come and undertake to have him at Westminster in the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February] to answer Thomas and the others concerning the transgression, because William is in remote parts. A day is given Thomas and the others at the bench. Bartholomew and the others appoint as their attorney the aforesaid Thomas. In the meantime, the sheriff is ordered to cease the distraint which he had made to William on the aforesaid occasion.
[Cross-references: B287, B344]

[Membrane 24d.]

Hundredum de Merden' Menbrum de Middelton'

The Hundred of Marden a part of Milton Regis

B429. Convictum est per juratam in quam Petrus Dudeman se posuit quod cum ispe dudum fuisset ballivus domini regis istius Hundredi et dominus Rex contulisset monachis de Roffa viginti Quercus in bosco suo de Merden' ad fabricam ecclesie sue, idem Petrus ad mandatum vicecomitis Kant' venit in eodem bosco ad deliberandum eis predictas quercus et predictam liberacionem eis fecit de quibusdam quercubus parvi pretii et ad fabricam suam minus competentibus, et eas signari fecit, et postmodo easdem emit a predictis monachis et cum illas emisset, decem ex illis prostari noluit, immo x de melioribus percepit, et x alias de melioribus ad opus suum elegit et prostari fecit. Et juratores quesiti quanti pretii predictae x fuerunt; dicunt quod unaquaque predictarum x quercuum maioris pretii fuit de ii solidis quam alie x prius signate. Dicunt etiam quod idem Petrus prostrari fecit et percepit ad opus v^{que} quercus preter predictas viginti de quibus habuit warrantum precia cuiuslibet v^{que} solidos unde summa xl solidos. Ideo respondeat domino regi de predictis xl solidis.² Et similiter de xx solidis³ de quibus predictae x quercus quas cepit auctoritate propria prevalebant aliis. Et sit in misericordia⁴ pro transgressionem.

B429. It is determined by the jury on which Peter Dodman placed himself that while he was the king's bailiff of this hundred and the king had given the monks of Rochester twenty oaks from his wood of Marden to build their church, Peter, at the sheriff of Kent's order, came to the wood to make up the gift of oaks [for] them and he made up the gift from certain oaks of lesser value and less suitable for the framework [of the church] and these [oaks] he marked out. Afterwards, he bought these from the monks and when he had bought them 10 of these he did not wish to fell. Rather, he received 10 of the best and chose 10 other good ones for his own use and felled them. The jurors were asked how much the aforesaid ten were worth. They said that each of the 10 great ones were worth 2 shillings more than the others already marked. They also say that Peter cut down and collected to his benefit 5 oaks apart from the twenty for which he had a warrant. The value of each [of these was] 5 shillings. Wherefore, the sum [is] 40 shillings. So he shall answer to the king concerning the 40 shillings. Likewise, [he shall answer] for 20 shillings for the 10 oaks which he took on his own authority, [because those oaks] were worth more than the others. He is in mercy for the transgression.

B430. Juratores presentant quod Magister Alexander Carpentarius domini regis quando missus fuit pro marheremio capiendo in bosco domini regis de Merden' ad opus ipsius domini regis prosternere fecit ad opus suum proprium quatuor quercus pretii xxxii solidorum et easdem dedit et vendidit pro voluntate sua. Dicunt etiam quod idem Alexander vendidit de corporibus lignorum que (maheremium¹) misit London' semel ad valenciam xx solidorum et illos ad opus suum retinuit. Ideo ad iudicium de eo.

²Margin note by scribe, xl. s. crossed out.

³Margin note by scribe, xx. s. crossed out.

⁴Margin note by scribe, mia' crossed out.

B430. The jurors present that when Master Alexander the king's carpenter was sent to collect timber in the king's wood of Marden for the king's use. [There] the master cut down four oaks worth 22 shillings for his own benefit. These he gave and sold at his own will. They also say that Alexnader sold [timber] from the heart of the forests, [this] timber he sent to London. This [timber], to the value of 20 shillings, he kept for his own use. So to *judgement* with him.

B431. Convictum est per juratam in quam Petrus Dudeman se posuit quod tempore quo fuit ballivus Hundredo de Merden' liberare fecit quibusdam tenentibus domini regis, alias quercus et meliores quam facere debuit pro consuetudine ipsos contingente. Quia cum unusquisque tenentium domini regis cuiuslibet denne habere debeant per annum quandam quercum in bosco domini regis pretii xviii denariorum (^{il}); predictus Petrus liberavit eis quercus multo maioris pretii et participavit cum eis de valore earumdem, ad dampnum domini regis xl solidorum, scilicet quolibet anno ^{or} annorum quibus ipse fuit ballivus ^{vque} solidos. Ideo respondeat domino Regi de predictis *xl solidis*.⁵ Et sit in misericordia pro transgressionem etc. Item idem Petrus cepit de Radulfo Fykatayl ^{or} *iiii* solidos pro quodam mortuo sepeliendo. Et de eodem Radulfo alias xviii denarios eo quod imposuit sibi quod quandam transgressionem fecisse debuit nec potuit se defendere per legem terre. Ideo respondeat domino regi de predictis *v solidis* et *vi denariis*.⁶ Item cepit de catallis cuiusdam Simonis de Chedherst dimidiam marcam et unum anulum aureum pretii dimidie marce occasione cuiusdam suspicionis latrocinii garbarum quod imponabatur eidem Simoni de quo non fuit culpabiles. Ideo preceptum est ei quod sine dilatione restituat ei predictam dimidiam marcam et similiter predictum anulum circa Octabis Purificacionis beate Marie, vel si non, quod satisfaciat ei de pretio.

B431. It is determined by the jury on which Peter Dodman placed himself that, while he was the bailiff of Marden, he delivered to the king's tenants other oaks and good [trees] beyond those [which] he ought to do according to custom. Since each tenant ought to have an oak as 'denne' per year in the king's wood worth 18 pence (^{il}), Peter gave them oaks worth much more and participated with them in the value of the same, to the king's loss of 40 shillings, namely for whichever year for the 4 years he was bailiff 5 shillings. So he shall answer to the king for the *40 shillings*. He is in mercy for the transgression. The same Peter took 4 shillings from Ralph Fykatayl for a burial. Elsewhere, [he took] 18 pence from Ralph, because he accused Ralph of a transgression against him; nor was Ralph able to defend himself by the law of the land. So he shall answer to the king for the *5 shillings* and *6 pence*. He also took a half mark and one gold ring, worth a half mark from the chattels of a certain Simon of Chedhurst, alleging on the occasion suspicion of the theft of sheaves of corn, concerning which [allegation] Simon was not found guilty. So Peter is ordered that without delay he restore the half mark and the ring to him around the octaves of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [9 February]. If not, then he shall satisfy him of the price.

B432.(adventus iusticiarii) Adam de Ridenne optulit se *iiii* die versus Johannem de la Dune et Michaellem Pantener (de placito quare^c) servientes Nicholai de Lenham de placito quare vi et armis venerunt ad terram ipsius Ade in Riddenne et blada in eadem terra existencia messuerunt et asportaverunt contra pacem etc. Et ipsi non venerunt et plures fecerunt defaultam. Et quia testatum est quod predicti Johannes et Michaelles malitiose se subtraxerunt. Preceptum est vicecomiti quod capiat in manum domini Regis omnes terras etc. Et quod de exitibus etc. Ita quod habeat corpora eorum coram H. le Bygod in proximo adventu etc.

B432.(Coming of the justiciar) Adam of Reinden Wood put in an appearance on the fourth day against John de la Dune and Michael Paneter, serjeants of Nicholas of Lenham, concerning a plea whereby they came with force of arms to Adam's land in Reinden Wood and reaped and carried off the crop standing on the land, against the peace. They have not come. They have

⁵Margin note by scribe, xl. s. crossed out.

⁶Margin note by scribe, v. s. vi. d. crossed out.

defaulted many times. Since it is testified that John and Michael wickedly withdrew themselves, the sheriff is ordered that he take into the king's hand all [their] lands. And from the outgoings etc. Thus, he shall have their bodies before [Hugh] Bigod in his next coming.

B433.(Querantur rotuli) Juratores presenatnt quod Petrus Dudeman quondam ballivus hundredi istius imposuit Ricardo de Hamme quod receptasse debuit filios suos qui occiderunt quendam hominem et per sic quod pacem habere potuit finem fecit cum eo per xl solidos quos ei soluit. Et Petrus presens est et dicit quod istud idem presentatum fuit coram G. de Preston' et sociis suis in ultimo itinere in comitatu isto et ibidem americiatus fuit occasione ista et de hoc ponit se super rotulos.

B433.(The rolls are to be examined) The jurors present that Peter Dodman, once bailiff of this hundred, alleged that Richard of Ham harboured his sons, who killed a man, and in order to be able to have the peace he made fine with Peter for 40 shillings, which he paid him. Peter is present and says that this was presented before [Gilbert] de Preston and his colleagues in the last eyre to this county and on that occasion he was amerced. On this he places himself upon the rolls.

B434. Convictum est per juratam in quam predictus Petrus se posuit quod predictus Petrus injuste extorsit de Agnete et Godelina filiis et heredibus Ricardi de Hengherst xx solidos imponens eis quod predictus Ricardus pater suus fuit in arreragio de tempore quo fuit subballivus suus in quia balliva non fuit nisi per quindecim dies quo tempore nichil recepit. Et ideo in misericordia et repondeat predictis heredibus de predicta pecunia etc.

B434. It is determined by the jury on which the aforesaid Peter placed himself that Peter unjustly extorted 20 shillings from Agnes and Godelina, daughters and heiresses of Richard of Henghurst, alleging that Richard, their father, was in arrears for the time when he was sub-bailiff, in which bailiwick he was [the sub-bailiff] for only fifteen days during which time he received nothing. So he is mercy. He shall answer to the heiresses for the money.

B435. Post venit predictus Petrus et finem fecit pro omnibus predictis transgressionibus et similiter pro pluribus aliis extorsionibus et injustis prisus quampluribus factis per *x libras*⁷ per plegium Thome Abelyn, Bartholomei de Moriston', Radulfi le Sauvag', Willelmi filii Margerie Dore, Bartholomei de Swainton', Nicholai Levenoth', Symoni de Chilton', Ricardi de Bynneye, Henrici de Burdeston', et Willelmi de Northdene etc.

B435. Afterwards, Peter came and made fine for *10 pounds* for all the aforesaid transgressions and likewise for the many other extortions and unjust prizes he took, by pledge of Thomas Aubeney, Bartholomew of Moriston, Ralph le Sauvage, William son of Margeret Dore, Bartholomew of Swanton, Nicholas Lennox, Simon of Chilton, Richard of Binney, Henry of Burdeston and William of Northdean.

[Membrane 25]

Deliberatio Gaole de Geldeford apud Bermundes' Coram H. le Bygod Juaticiaro Anglie et Egidio de Erdington'. In Crastino sancti Edmundi Martiri, Anno xliiii.

Gaol Delivery from Guildford at Bermondsey before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England and Giles of Erdington on the Morrow of the Blessed Edmund Martyr year 43 [21 November 1258].

B436.(Surr') Robertus de Weston' rettatus de pluribus latrocinis et malefactis venit. Et defendit omne latrocinium et malefactum et totum etc. Et ponit se super patriam de bone et malo. Et xii juatores de Hundredo de Wudeton'. Et iiii^{or} villate propinquiores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Robertus non est culpabiles de aliquo malefacto. Ideo inde *quietus*.

⁷Margin note by scribe, x. li. crossed out.

- B436.(Surrey) Robert of Weston accused of numerous thefts and wrong-doings comes and denys all theft, wrong-doing and everything. He places himself on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Wotton and the 4 neighbouring villas say upon their oath that Robert is not guilty of any wrong-doing. So he is *quit*.
- B437.(Surr', +) Hugo de Windesour' et Ricardus le Tayllur serviens eius rettati de receptamento Segrim de Horselegh', Robertum Dubbeden' et aliorum malefactorum qui occidisse debuerunt Andream le Chapeleyn de Dorking', veniunt et defendunt omne receptamentum et totum. Et ponunt se super patriam de bono et malo. Et quia non dum convictum est, utrum predicti Segrim, Robertus culpabiles fuerunt de predicta vel non, dictum est vicecomiti quod capiat securitatem a predictis Hugone et Ricardo usque in adventu justicarii, scilicet salvos plegios standi recto etc.
- B437.(Surrey, +) Hugh of Windsor and his serjeant Robert Tailor accused of harbouring, Seagrim of Horsley, Robert Dubbenden' and other wrong-doers, who killed Andrew le Chaplain of Dorking, come and deny all harbouring and everything. They place themselves on the country for good or ill. Since it is not yet determined whether Seagrim and Robert were guilty of the aforesaid or not, it is said to the sheriff that he take security from Hugh and Richard until the coming of the justiciar, namely saving the pledges to stand to right.
- B438.(Surr', Hundedum de Wock', s) Henricus Harm (de Sende¹) Willelmus atte Hoke et Ricardus atte Lane indictati de pluribus latrocinis coram Davide de Jarpenvill' vicecomite ad turnum suum in Hundredo de Wockyng', veniunt et defendunt omne latrocinium et totum etc. et de bone et malo ponunt se super patriam. Et duodecim juratores de Hundredo de Wocking' et ⁱⁱⁱⁱ^{or} villate propinquoires dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predicti Henricus et alii culpabiles sunt de latrocinio bidentium et aliis pluribus malefactis. Ideo [*suspendabuntur*]. Catalla predicti Henrici (*xxi solidos*)⁸ unde Davidus de Jarpenvill' vicecomes respondeat. Catalla predicti Riardi *iii solidos*.⁹ Et Catalla predicti Willelmi *ix solidos, iii denarios*¹⁰ unde idem vicecomes respondeat.
- B438.(Surrey, The Hundred of Woking, s) Henry Harm of Send, William atte Hook and Richard atte Lane, indicted of numerous thefts before the sheriff David of Jarpenvill at his tourn in the hundred of Woking, come and deny all theft and everything. They place themselves on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Woking and the 4 neighbouring villas say upon their oath that Henry and the others are guilty of stealing sheep and other wrong-doings. So [*they are to be hanged*]. Wherefore, David of Jarpenvill the sheriff shall answer for Henry's chattels [worth] *21 shillings*, Richard's chattels [worth] *3 shillings* [and] William's chattels [worth] *9 shillings* [and] *3 pence*.
- B439.(Hundredum de Cappede Thorne) Hugo le Kutel de Chelesham captus pro suspicione latrocinii venit et defendit omne latrocinium et totum etc. et de bono et malo ponit se super patriam. Et duodecim juratores predicti Hundredi et quatuor villate propinquoires, dicunt super sacramentum suum quod non malecredunt ipsum de aliquo malefacto. Ideo inde *quietus*.
- B439.(The Hundred of Copthorne) Hugh le Kutel of Chelsham arrested for suspicion of theft comes and denys all theft and everything and for good or ill places himself on the country. Twelve jurors from the aforesaid hundred and the four neighbouring villas say upon their oath that they do not suspect him of any wrong-doing. So he is *quit*.
- B440.(Waleton', quieti) Thomas filius Humfridi de Waleton' et Johannes filius pistoris rettati de latrocinio bidentium veniunt et defendunt omne latrocinium et totum etc. et de bono et malo

⁸Margin note by scribe, *xxi. s.* crossed out.

⁹Margin note by scribe, *iii. s.* crossed out.

¹⁰Margin note by scribe, *ix. s. iii. d.* crossed out.

ponunt se super patriam. Et duodecim juratores predicti Hundredo et quatuor villate propinquiores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod non malecredunt ipsos de aliquo latrocinio nec de aliquo (alioⁱ) malefacto. Ideo inde *quieti*.

B440.(Wallington, quit) Thomas son of Humfrey of Wallington and John son of the baker accused of stealing sheep come and deny all theft and everything and for good or ill place themselves on the country. Twelve jurors from the aforesaid hundred and the four neighbouring villas say upon their oath that they are not suspected of any theft nor of any wrong-doing. So they [are] *quit*.

B441. Walterus de Snodeham in *miserecordia* pro contemptu curie.

B441. Walter of Snowdenham [is] in *mercy* for contempt of court.

B442.(Blakehetfeld) Ricardus le Surir de Midherst captus pro suspicione latrocinii venit et defendit totum omne latrocinium et totum etc. et de bono et malo ponit se super patriam. Et duodecim juratores predicti Hundredi et quatuor villate propinquiores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod non est culpabilis de aliquo malefacto. Ideo inde *quietus*.

B442.(Blackheath) Richard le Surir from Midhurst arrested for suspicion of theft comes and denies all theft and everything and for good or ill places himself on the country. Twelve jurors from the aforesaid hundred and the four neighbouring villas say upon their oath that he is not guilty of any wrong-doing. So he [is] *quit*.

B443. Willelmus le Wudeward de Bolham captus pro suspicione latrocinii de bidentibus et aliis malefactis venit. Et defendit latrocinium et totum. Et ponit se super patriam de bono et malo. Et xii juratores de Hundredo de Effingham et iiii^{or} villate propinquiores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod non est culpabilis de illo malefacto, nec de aliquo alio. Ideo inde *quietus*.

B443. William le Woodward of Ballam arrested for suspicion of stealing sheep and other wrong-doings comes. He denies theft and everything. For good or ill he places himself on the country. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Effingham and the 4 neighbouring villas say upon their oath that he is not guilty of this wrong-doing nor of anything else. So he [is] *quit*.

B444.(S) Thomas le Verrer de Suthwerk' et Radulphus de Lidgat' rettati de pluribus latrociniiis, roberiis et aliis malefactis veniunt. Et predictus Radulfus defendit omne latrocinium, roberiam et totum etc. Et de bono et malo ponit se super patriam. Et predictus Thomas dicit quod clericus est et non potest, ne vult hic respondere. Et super hoc venit Decanus Christainitatis de Suthwerk'. Et petit ipsum tamquam clericum. Et ut sciatur pro quali liberari debeat inquiratur rei veritas per patriam. Et xii juratores Burgi de Suthwerk' dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Thomas aliquo tempore uxoratus fuit et decedente uxore sua non habuit unde potuit ipsam facere sepeliri, vel alia jura (habereⁱ) ecclesiastica. Et dicunt quod idem Thomas postea sepius transstulit se ad alias partes paupertate dictus et pluries rediit noctanter ad domum suam in villa de Suthwerk' cum pluribus aliis qui noctanter recesserunt a domo illa, et quod secum detulit fardellos pannorum et alia bona, et quod iste Radulfus captus fuit in societate sua. Et juratores quesiti si predicti Thomas et Radulfus culpabiles sint de predictis malefactis vel aliquibus aliis, dicunt quod sic. Ideo predictus Radulfus [*suspendatur*]. Nulla habuit catalla. Et predictus Decanus quesitus si habeat litteras patentes Archiepiscopi vel aliquid aliud per quod predictus Thomas debet (eiⁱ) liberari, nichil ostendit ideo predictus Thomas *custodiat*. Catalla eius *xiii solidos, vi denarios* unde Davidus Jarpenvill' vicecomes respondeat.

Postea testatum est quod predictus Radulfus habuit terras et catalla apud Lidgat' in Comitatu Suff'. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod inquirat etc. Et scire faciat.

B444.(S) Thomas le Ver of Southwark and Ralph of Lidgate accused of numerous thefts, robberies and other wrong-doings come. Ralph denies all theft, robbery and everything. He

places himself on the country for good or ill. Thomas says that he is a clerk and is not able, nor does he wish to answer. Concerning this, the archdeacon of Southwark comes and claims him as a clerk. In order that it might be known how Ralph is to be freed, the truth of the matter is to be inquired by the country. Twelve jurors from the borough of Southwark say upon their oath that Thomas was once married, and his wife lay dying [and] he did not have the where with all with which he could have her buried nor have other ecclesiastical rights [performed]. They say that because of [his] poverty Thomas often left for other parts and returned by night to his house in the vill of Southwark many times with others who had left the house by night, and he brought [with him] bundles of bread and other goods. Ralph was taken in their company. The jurors were asked if Thomas and Ralph were guilty of the wrong-doings or any others; they said yes. So Ralph [*is to be hanged*]. He has no chattels. The deacon was asked if he had letters patent from the archbishop or any other by which Thomas ought to be freed. He showed nothing. So Thomas is to be taken into *custody*. Wherefore, David of Jarpenvill, the sheriff, shall answer for his chattels *14 shillings* [and] *6 pence*.

Afterwards, it is testified that Ralph has lands and chattels at Lidgate in the county of Suffolk. So the sheriff is ordered that he inquire into [these things] and he shall make [his findings] known.

B445. Johannes Heythorn de Cheyham rettatus de latrocinio cuiusdam bovis et de aliis malefactis venit et defendit omne latrocinium et totum etc. Et ponit se super patriam de bono et malo. Et xii juratores de Hundredo de Waleton'. Et similiter xii juratores de hundredo de Coppedethorn' et villate propinquiores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Johannes non est culpabiles de aliquo malefacto; ideo inde *quietus*.

B445. John Heythorne of Cheam accused of the theft of an ox and of other wrong-doings comes and denys all theft and everything. He places himself on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Wallington and 12 jurors from the hundred of Copthorne and the neighbouring villas say upon their oath that John is not guilty of any wrong-doing. So he [*is*] *quit*.

B446. Phillipus de Wamberg' rettatus de latrocinio et roberiis dicit quod clericus est et non debet nec vult hic respondere. Et super hoc venit Decanus Christianitatis de Suthwerk' et petit ipsum tamquam clericum set nullas litteras alicuius Diocesani detulit per quas idem Phillipus ei debeat liberari. Et (quia^c) testatum per Robertum de Gatton' Coronatorem quod ipse cum quibusdam aliis furatus fuit quemdam cifum de mazer et inde habuit ad partem suam [de] quinque denariis. Et quia predictus Decanus nullas litteras alicuius Dyocesani per quas ei debeat liberari. Ideo predictus Phillipus *custodiatur*.

B446. Philip of Wanborough accused of theft and robberies says that he is a clerk and ought not, nor wishes to answer. Concerning this, the archdeacon of Southwark comes and claims him as a clerk, but he brought no diocesan letters whatsoever by which Philip ought to be freed to him. It is testified by Robert of Gatton the coroner that Philip along with others stole a maplewood bowl and thereafter he had his share of 15 pence. Since the deacon has [shown] no diocesan letters whatsoever by which he ought to be freed to him, Philip is to be taken into *custody*.

B447.(S) Walterus atteWidie et Ricardus de Westcot' capti pro suspicione latrocinii veniunt et defendunt-- (omne^e)-latrocinium et totum etc. Et de bono et malo ponunt se super patriam. Et xii juratores Hundredo de Wodeton' simul cum xii juratoribus Hundredo de Woking' simul cum quatuor villatis propinquieribus dicunt super sacramnetum suum quod predictus Walterus non est culpabiles de aliquo malefacto. Ideo inde *quietus*. Et de predicto Ricardo dicunt quod culpabilis est de burgariis et aliis malefactis. Ideo [*suspendatur*]. Nulla habuit catalla.

B447.(S) Walter atte Wood and Richard of Westcott arrested for suspicion of theft come and deny theft and everything. They place themselves on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Wotton, along with 12 jurors from the hundred of Woking, along with the four neighbouring villas say upon their oath that Walter is not guilty of any wrong-

doing. So he [is] *quit*. Concerning Richard they say that he is guilty of burglary and other wrong-doings. So [*he is to be hanged*]. He has no chattels.

B448. Ricardus le Berners captus pro suspicione (receptamenti¹) latronum venit et defendit (lat^c) receptamentum et totum etc. Et de bono et malo ponit se super patriam. Et xii juratores Hundredo de Reygat' simul cum quatuor villatis propinquieribus dicunt super sacramentum suum quod non est culpabilis de aliquo malefacto. Ideo inde *quietus*.

B448. Richard le Berners arrested for suspicion of harbouring thieves comes and denys the harbouring and everything. He places himself on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Reigate along with the four neighbouring villas say upon their oath that he is not guilty of any wrong-doing. So he [is] *quit*.

B449.(Midd', S) Johannes Page, Rogerus de Holesl', Willelmus de Reydon' et Gilbertus Sely capti et rettati de pluribus latrociniiis et roberiis (et Johannes de Coventr' de receptamento¹) veniunt. Et defendunt omne latrocionium, roberiam et totum etc. Et ponunt se super patriam de bono et malo. Et xii juratores de Comitatu Middelsex' et iii^{or} villate de visneto circa Acton' dicunt super sacramentum suum quod culpabiles sunt de pluribus roberiis et malefactis. Ideo [*suspendantur*]. Nulla haberunt catalla.

B449.(Middlesex, S) John Page, Roger of Horsley, William of Royton and Gilbert Sely arrested and accused of numerous thefts and robberies, and John le Coventry [also arrested] for harbouring, come. They deny all theft, robbery and everything. They place themselves on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the county of Middlesex and the 4 neighbouring villas around Acton say upon their oath that they are guilty of numerous robberies and wrong-doings. So [they are to be hanged]. They have no chattels.

[Membrane 25d.]

Deliberatio Gaole Cantuar' coram H. le Bygod Justiciario Anglie et Egidio Erdington' die Jovis proxima post Octabis sancti Hillarii anno, xliii.

Gaol Delivery at Canterbury before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England and Giles Erdington on the First Thursday after the Octaves of Saint Hillary year 43 [23 January 1259].

B450.(S) Henricus Dore, Johannes pistor de Newenham, Ernaldus le Marescallus, Thomas de Thruleg', Henricus Smalheth' et Rogerus filius Maiote rettati de pluribus latrociniiis et roberiis et receptamentis latrocinii veniunt et predictus Rogerus dicit quod clericus est et non potest hic respondere. Et super hoc venit Decanus Christianitatis Cantuar' (officiali Archiepiscopi Cant'ⁱ.) Et petit ipsum tamquam clericum. Et liberatur ei, set ut sciatur qualiter ei liberetur inquiratur rei veritas per patriam. Et Henricus et omnes alii defendunt latrocinium et totum etc. Et ponunt se super patriam de bono et malo. Et xii juratores de Hundredo de Faversham et xii juratores de Hundredo Felebreg' simul cum xii juratores de Hundredo de Bocton' dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predicti Ernaldus le Marescallus, Thomas de Thruleg' et Henricus Smalsteth non sunt culpabiles de aliquo malefacto. Ideo ipsi inde *quieti*. Et de predictis Henrico Dore (Roger¹) et Johanne pistore de Newenham (dicunt quod¹) culpabiles sunt de pluribus roberiis et malefactis. Ideo predicti Henricus et Johannes [*suspendantur*]. Et predictus Rogerus liberatur Officiali etc.

B450.(S) Henry Dore, John baker from Newnham, Ernald le Marshal, Thomas of Throwley, Henry Small Hithe and Roger son of Mayote accused of numerous thefts, robberies and the harbouring of thieves, come. Roger says that he is a clerk and is not able to answer here. Concerning this, the archdeacon of Canterbury, an official of the archbishop of Canterbury, comes and claims him as a clerk. He is freed to him, but in order that it may be known how he is to be freed to him, the truth is to be inquired by the country. Henry and the others deny everything. They place themselves on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Faversham, 12 jurors from the hundred of Felborough along with 12 jurors from the

hundred of Boughton say upon their oath that Ernald le Marshal, Thomas of Throwley and Henry Small Heath are not guilty of any wrong-doing. So they [are] *quit*. They say Henry Dore, Roger and John baker of Newnham are guilty of numerous robberies and wrong-doings. So Henry and John [*are to be hanged*]. Roger is to be freed to the official.

B451.(C) Johannes de Thrulegh' et Radulfus de Kingeston' capti pro eadem suspicione latrocinii pro quam predicti Henricus et Johannes capti fuerunt veniunt et nolunt ponere se super patriam. Ideo remittuntur gaolam custodiendi quousque etc.

B451.(C) John of Throwley and Ralph of Kingston arrested for the same suspicion of theft for which the aforesaid Henry and John were taken, come and refuse to place themselves on the country. So they are to remain in gaol in custody until [the king orders otherwise]..

B452.(S) Willelmus de la Herde captus pro suspicione latrocinii venit et cognovit quod inter fuit (cuidamⁱ) roberie facte ad domum Johannis propositi de Bocton' et similiet pluribus roberiis factis in le Blen. Ideo [*suspendatur*].

B452.(S) William de la Herde arrested for suspicion of theft comes and acknowledges that he was involved in a robbery to the home of John steward of Boughton and likewise [with] numerous robberies committed in le Blean. So [*is to be hanged*].

B453.(S) Johannes le Leghere et Stephanus Brodegh', Thomas le Clerk de Offpreng' (et Thomas Tracy et Thomas de Redeⁱ) rettati de quadam roberia facta apud Bocton' ad domum propositi de Bocton' et similiter de quadam roberia facta ad domum parsonae de Padeleswrth' et de pluribus roberiis factis in le Blen et similiter de aliis malefactis. Et Johannes de Malling' rettatus de receptamento eorumdem veniunt et predictus Thomas le Clerk dicit quod clericus est et non potest hic respondere. Et super hoc venit Decanus Christianitatis Cantuar' Officialis Archiepiscopi Cantuar' et petit ipsum tamquam clericum et liberatur ei set ut sciatur qualiter ei liberetur inquiratur veritas per patriam. Et predicti Johannes, Stephanus et Johannes de Malling' deffendunt roberiam, receptamentum et totum etc. Et ponunt se super patriam de bono et malo. Et xii juratores de Hundredo (de Hundredo^f) de Boctone simul cum xii juratores de Hundredo de Felesbergh' dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predicti Thomas le Clerk, Thomas Tracy, Thomas de Rede et Johannes de Malling' non sunt culpabiles de aliquo malefacto nec receptamento. Ideo predicti Thomas et alii inde *quieti*. Dicunt etiam quod Johannes le Leghere et Stephanus Brodegh' culpabiles sunt de pluribus roberiis et malefactis. Ideo ipsi [*suspendantur*].

B453.(S) John le Legere, Stephen Brockley, Thomas le Clerk of Ospringe, Thomas Tracy and Thomas of Rede accused of a robbery carried out at Boughton on the home of the steward of Boughton and likewise of a robbery carried out on the home of the parson of Paddlesworth and numerous robberies committed in le Blean and numerous other wrong-doings, and John of Malling accused of harbouring them, come. Thomas le Clerk says that he is a clerk and is not able to answer here. Concerning the above, the archdeacon of Canterbury, an official of the archbishop of Canterbury, comes and claims him as a clerk. Thomas is freed to him, but in order that it may be known how he is to be freed, the truth is to be inquired by the country. John, Stephen and John of Malling deny robbery, harbouring and everything. They place themselves on the country for good or ill. Twelve jurors from the hundred of Boughton along with 12 jurors from the hundred of Felborough say upon their oath that Thomas le Clerk, Thomas Tracy, Thomas of Rede and John of Malling are not guilty of any wrong-doing nor of harbouring. So Thomas and the others [are] *quit*. They say that John le Legere and Stephen Brockley are guilty of numerous robberies and wrong-doings. So they [*are to be hanged*].

Inquisitionis facta de Mal [leaves off abruptly]

Inquiries Taken Concerning Sick

[Membrane 26]

Essonia de Malo Veniendi Capta apud Bermund' Coram H. le Bygot Justiciario Anglie, in Crastino beati Edmundi Martiri, anno xliii.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken at Bermondsey before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England on the Morrow of the Blessed Edmund the Martyr year 43 [21 November 1258].

B454.(Surr', no +) Johannes filius Galfridi versus Symonem filium Ade de Wautham de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Willelmum de Cotton'. Die Jovis (proxima ⁱ) post quindenam sancti Martini per plegium Phillipi de Boklaund' et breve remaneat versus vicomitem.

B454.(Surrey, a new one) John son of Geoffrey against Simon son of Adam of Waltham concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by William of Cotton. On the next Thursday after the quindene of Saint Martin [28 November] by pledge of Philip of Bocland. The writ remains with the sheriff.

B455.(Surr', no +) Phillipus filius Nygelli de Burgate versus Willelmum de Buragte de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Mathiam de Bovill' die Jovis proximo post quindenam sancti Martini, et breve remaneat versus vicecomitem.

B455.(Surrey, a new one) Philip son of Nigel of Burgate against William of Burgate concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Matthew of Bovill on the next Thursday after the quindene of Saint Martin [28 November]. The writ remains with the sheriff.

B456.(Surr') (Margereta de^c) Gattesden' versus Gilbertus de Colevile de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Walterum de Ockleye non jacet quia de comitatu.

B456.(Surrey, [cancelled]) Margeret of Gatesden against Gilbert of Colevill concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by William of Ockley. [The essoyn] does not lie since it concerns the county.

B457.(Surr') (Johannes de Gatesden^c) versus Gilbertum de Colevill' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Robertum filium Simoni non jacet quia de comitatu.

B457.(Surrey, [cancelled]) John of Gatesden against Gilbert of Colevill concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Robert son of Simon. [The essoyn] does not lie since it concerns the county.

B458.(Surr') (Johannes de Wellnes^c) versus eundem Gilbertum de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Ricardum de Pyridon'. Non jacet quia de comitatu.

B458.(Surrey, [cancelled]) John of Wellnes against the same Gilbert concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Richard of Piriton. [The essoyn] does not lie since it concerns the county.

Essonia de malo Veniendi capta apud Bermundes' coram H. le Bygod Justiciario Anglie die Lune proxima post festum sancte Lucie.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken at Bermondsey before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England on the First Monday after the Feast of Saint Lucy [16 December].

B459.(Surr', no +, alius in brevi) Johannes filius Johannis versus Abbatem de Lattel' de placito assise ultime presentacionis per Willelmum Gandreslile in crastino Epiphani domini coram H. le Bygod apud Westmonasterium, affidavit. Idem dies datus est Johanni de Warenn' qui nominatus in brevi per attonatum suum in Banco et similiter omnibus recognitoribus veniunt. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat ad eundem terminum. Et sciendum quod breve originale remaneat penes vicecomes.

B459.(Surrey, a new one, others in the writ) John son of John against the abbot of Netley concerning a plea of last presentment by William Gandreslile on the morrow of the Epiphany

of the Lord [7 January] before [Hugh] Bigod at Westminster. He pledged his faith. The same day is given John de Warrene, who is named in the writ, through his attorney at the bench and likewise to all the recognitors [who] came. The sheriff is ordered that he make them come at the same term. It is known that the original writ remains with the sheriff.

Essonia de malo veniendi Capta Coram H. le Bygod apud Cantuar' in Crastino sancti Hillarii, anno xliii.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken before [Hugh] Bigod at Canterbury on the Morrow of Saint Hillary year 43 [14 January 1259].

B460.(London', ve +) Johannes Renger versus Johannem de Asphal' et Aliciam uxorem eius de placito (detentione carte unde¹) lex ----vadium per Osbertum clericum, (a die sancti Hillarii in xv dies, affidaverunt.^c) In Crastino Purificacionis beate Marie apud London'---- Affidaverunt.

B460.(London, an old one) John Renger against John of Aspley Guise and Alice his wife concerning a plea of withheld charter wherefore law----pledge by Osbert clerk. On the morrow of the Purification of the Blessed Mary [3 February] at London.---- They pledged their faith.

Essonia de malo veniendi capta coram H. le Bygod Justiciario Anglie apud Lechelad' in Comitatu Glouc' in crastino clausi Pasche, anno regni Regis H. filii Regis Johannis xliii.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England at Lechlade in the County of Gloucestershire on the Morrow of the Close of Easter in the Regnal Year of King [Henry] son of King John 43 [21 April 1259].¹¹

B461.(Glouc', no +) Magister Emeritus de Egeblanche versus Thomam de Quercy de placito assise ultime presentacionis per Jacobam de Boseby a die Pasche in unum mensem apud Westmonasterium.--Affidavit. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat recognitores assise illius ad eundem terminum.

B461.(Gloucestershire, a new one) Master Emory of Egeblanche against Thomas of Quercy concerning an assize of last presentment by James of Boseby a month from Easter [12 May] at Westminster.--He pledged his faith. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of this assize come at the same term.

B462.(Glouc', no +) Ricardus filius Osberti versus Johannem de Ponte et Paviam uxorem eius de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Nicholaum de Thormareton', in proximo adventu H. le Bygod. Affidavit. Et sciendum quod breve remaneat penes vicecomes.

B462.(Gloucestershire, a new one) Richard son of Osbert against John of Bridge and Pam his wife concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Nicholas of Tormarton in the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod. He pledged his faith. It is known that the writ remains with the sheriff.

B463.(Glouc', no +) Robertus Walereand' versus magisterum Henricum de Wyleby de placito jurate xxiiii^{or} ad convicendum xxi unde querens etc. per Walterum de Helyun. Affidavit. Willermus Walerand' versus eundem de eodem per Ricardum capellanum. Affidavit. Phillipus de Kant' versus eundem de eodem per Henricum clericum. Affidavit. Johanna que fuit uxor Thome de Berkel' de eodem per Ricardum le Futur' in proximo adventu H. le Bygod etc. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod habeat corpora (predictorum^{ul}) recognitorum predictae jurate et etiam corpora xii prioris assise ad eundem terminum. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem.

¹¹All of the remaining essoins recorded below pertain to sessions held as part of a later Bigod eyre, whose business is to be found on Just 1/1188.

B463.(Gloucestershire, a new one) Robert Walerand against Master Henry of Wyleby concerning a jury of 24 to attain 12, wherein [he is] the plaintiff, by Walter of Heliun. He pledged his faith.

William Walerand against the same concerning the same, by Richard chaplain. He pledged his faith.

Philip of Kent against the same concerning the same, by Henry clerk. He pledged his faith.

Johanna who was the wife of Thomas of Berkeley concerning the same, by Richard le Futur, in the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod. The sheriff is ordered that he have the bodies of the recognitors of the aforesaid jury and also the bodies of the 12 [jurors] of the earlier assize at the same term. The writ remains with the sheriff.

Essonia de malo veniendi Capta apud Oxon' coram H. le Bygod Justiciario Anglie Die mercurii proximo post Clausum Pasche, Anno xliii.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken at Oxford before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England on the next Wednesday after the Close of Easter year 43 [20 April 1259].

B464.(Oxon', no +, b. +, Ex jur.) Matilda que fuit uxor Thome de Draiton' versus Walterum filium Thome de Draiton' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Walterum Attetroy etc. A die Pasche in unum mensem apud Westmonasterium. Affidavit. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat recognitores assise illius ad eundem terminum.

B464.(Oxfordshire, a new one , b.+, exaction of the jurors) Matilda who was the wife of Thomas of Drayton against Walter son of Thomas of Drayton concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor, by Walter Atteroy. One month from Easter [12 May] at Westminster. She pledged her faith. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of that assize come at the same term.

B465.(Oxon', no +, b +, Ex jur') Willelmus de Bandinton' versus Amiciam filiam Willelmi de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Johannem Doly. Affidavit. Willelmus filius Willelmi Bandinton' versus eandem de eodem per Willelmum Schothe ---- Affidavit. Lucas frater eiusdem Willelmi versus eandem de eodem---per Radulfum Burgan. A die Pasche in unum mensem apud Westmonasterium. Affidavit. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat recognitores assise illius ad eundem terminum. Et concessum est quod Elyas de la Penne sequatur et respondeat pro predicta Amicia eo quod ispa est infra etatem.

B465.(Oxfordshire, a new one, b.+, exaction of the jurors) William of Bainton against Amy daughter of William concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by John Doilly. He pledged his faith. William son of William Bainton against the same concerning the same, by William Scotch---- He pledged his faith. Luke, William's brother, against the same concerning the same---- by Ralph Burgan. One month from Easter [12 May] at Westminster. He pledged his faith. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of that assize come at the same term. It is granted that Ellis de la Penne is to sue and shall answer for Amy because she is under age.

Essonia de malo veniendi Capta apud Reding' Die veneris proximo post clausum Pascha, coram H. le Bigod Justiciario Anglie, anno xliii.

Essions of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken at Reading on the next Friday after the Close of Easter before [Hugh] Bigod Justiciar of England year 43 [25 April 1259].

B466.(Berk', no +, Ex jur') Willelmus de sancta Elena versus Johannem Sundy de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Nicholaum Gravenel in octabis sancte Trinitatis apud Westmonasterium.--Affidavit. Et nullus recognitorum venerunt. Ideo vicecomes habeat corpora ad eundem terminum etc.

B466.(Berkshire, a new one, exaction of the jurors) William of Saint Hellens against John Sundy concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor, by Nicholas Gravelly in the octaves of Saint Trinity [15 June] at Westminster.--He pledged his faith. None of the recognitors came. So the sheriff

shall have their bodies at the same term.

B467.(Berk') Rogerus le Guneys versus Willelmum Hervey de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Willelmum filium Reginaldi [leaves off abruptly]

B467.(Berkshire) Roger le Guneys against William Hervey concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by William son of Reginald

B468.(Berk', no +, Ex jur') Prior de Hurlee versus Robertum de Sotebrok' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Ricardum Marescallum in proximo adventu H. le Bygod Justiciarii Anglie ad partes istas. Affidavit. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire facit recognitores assise illius ad eundem terminum. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem. Et Robertus ponit loco suo (Terri^S) Russell' vel Ricardum de Stradebrok'.

B468.(Berkshire, a new one, exaction of the jurors) The prior of Hurley against Robert of Shottesbrook concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Richard Marshal in the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod, Justiciar of England, to these parts. He pledged his faith. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of that assize come at the same term. The writ remains with the sheriff. Robert appoints as his attorneys Terry Russel or Richard of Stradebrok'.

B469.(Berk', no +, Ex jur') Auriella (habet virumⁱ) uxor Willelmi de Abberle versus Johannem le Fraunceys de Wyndesor' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Galfridum filium Willelmi, in proximo adventu H. le Bygod Justicarii Anglie ad partes istas. Affidavit. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat recognitores assise illius ad eundem terminum. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem.

B469.(Berkshire, a new one, exaction of the jurors) Aurella, she has a husband, wife of William of Abberle against John le Franceys of Windsor concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Geoffrey son of William, in the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod, Justiciar of England to these parts. She pledged her faith. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of that assize come at the same term. The writ remains with the sheriff.

B470.(Berk', no +, Ex jur') Walterus faber de Ingepenne versus Robertum Isaac de Hungerford de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Adam de Radeford in proximo adventu H. le Bygod Justiciarii Anglie ad partes istas. Affidavit. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat recognitores assise illius ad eundem terminum. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem.

B470.(Berkshire, a new one, exaction of the jurors) Walter smith of Inkpen against Robert Isaac of Hungerford concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Adam of Radford in the next coming of [Hugh] Bigod, Justiciar of England, to these parts. He pledged his faith. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of that assize come at the same term. The writ remains with the sheriff.

Essonia de malo veniendi capta apud Newport Paynel in Comitatu Buk' die Jovis in Septimana Pentecoste Anno, xliii.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken at Newport Pagnell in the County of Buckinghamshire on Thursday in the Week of Pentecost year 43 [5 June 1259].

B471.(Buk') Robertus de Cyrencestr' attornatus Prioris de Merton' versus Willelmum Thurstan de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Walterum filium Ricardi die Martis proximo post Octabas sancte Trinitatis apud Bed'. Affidavit. Idem dies datus est Miloni de Hastings et Dionisie uxori eius quos idem Prior vocat ad warrantum versus eum per attornatos suos in Banco. Walterus de Newport alterus attornatus versus eundem de eodem per Gilbertum Gos. Affidavit. (il) Milo de Astinges et Dionisia uxor eius warrantizant.

B471.(Buckinghamshire) Robert of Cirencester attorney for the prior of Merton against William

Thurstan concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Walter son of Richard on the next Tuesday after the octaves of Saint Trinity [17 June] at Bedford. He pledged his faith. The same day is given Miles of Hastings and Denise his wife whom the prior called to warrant against him, through their attorney at the bench. Walter Newport another attorney against the same concerning the same by Gilbert Gos. He pledged his faith. () Miles of Hastings and Denise his wife warrant [him].

B472.(Buk', no +) Abbas de Medmeham versus Willelmum de Horton' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Radulfum filium Willelmi, die Martis proximo post festum sancte Trinitatis apud Bed'. Affidavit. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem et dictum est vicecomiti quod faciat venire juratores ad prefatum terminum.

B472.(Buckinghamshire, a new one) The abbot of Medmenham against William of Horton concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Ralph son of William on the next Tuesday after the feast of Saint Trinity [17 June] at Bedford. The writ remains with the sheriff. It is said to the sheriff to make the jurors come at the aforesaid term.

B473.(Buk', no +) Robertus filius Basille versus Willelmum le Forest' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Reginaldum de Eton', Die Martis proximo post festum sancte Trinitatis apud Bed'. Affidavit. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem. Et Willelmus ponit loco suo Galfridum le Forest' filium suum.

B473.(Buckinghamshire, a new one) Robert son of Basilia against William le Forester concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Reginald of Eaton on the next Tuesday after the feast of Saint Trinity [17 June] at Bedford. He pledged his faith. The writ remains with the sheriff. William appoints as his attorney his son Geoffrey le Forester.

B474. Memorandum quod J. Welond' tradidit brevem suum W. de Beckewell' ad distringendum (il) filius Aucheri.

B474. Memorandum that J. Weylond handed over his writ to W. of Buckwell to distrain () son of Aucher.

[Membrane 26d.]

Adhuc de Essonia die Jovis in Septimana Pentecoste apud Neuport Paynel anno xliii.

Still Concerning Essoins on the Thursday in the Week of Pentecost at Newport Pagnell year 43 [5 June 1259].

B475.(Buk') Petrus de Winton' versus Isabellam Dene de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Johannem Grey [leaves off abruptly]

B475.(Buckinghamshire) Peter of Winchester against Isabel Dean concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by John Grey

B476.(Buk', error) Abbas sancti Albani versus Johannem de Mortoyne et Constanciam uxorem eius de placito assise ultime presentacionis per Simonem filium Hugoni [leaves off abruptly]

B476.(Buckinghamshire, error) The abbot of Saint Albans against John of Morton and Constance his wife concerning a plea of last presentment by Simon son of Hugh

Essonia de malo veniendi Capta apud Hunt' die Veneris proxima post festum sancte Trinitatis anno xliii.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken at Huntingdon on the next Friday after the Feast of Saint Trinity year 43 [14 June 1259].

B477.(Hunt') Petrus de Lillebon versus Willemum Goldring' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Bartholomeum filium Johannis [leaves off abruptly]

B477.(Huntingdonshire) Peter of Lillebon against William Goldringer concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Bartholomew son of John

Essonia apud Cantebrig' die Mercurii proximo post Ocatbas sancte Trinitatis anno xliii.

Essoins at Cambridge on the next Wednesday after the Octaves of Saint Trinity year 43 [18 June 1259].

B478.(Hunt', ve +) Johannes de Litlebyr' (habet uxor Mageriaⁱ) quem Ricardus de Hemmington' et Amicia uxor eius vocat ad warantum versus Alanum de Bollon' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Ivonem de Dudinton' in crastino sancti Johannis Baptiste apud War' in Comitatu Hereford'.--Affidavit. Idem dies datus est Margerie uxori (predictiⁱ) Johannis de Litlebyr' et predictis Ricardo et Amicie uxori eius per attornatum suum in Banco. Et nullus regonitorum venerunt. Ideo vicecomes habeat corpora etc. Et Margeria ponit loco suo Johannem de Finchingfend' etc.--Post venit predictus Ricardus et ponit loco suo Radulfum de Stiventon' vel Johannem de Catenh' (etc.ⁱ) et amovet Johannem clericum que prius etc.

B478.(Huntingdonshire, an old one) John of Littlebury, he has a wife Marjery, who Richard of Hemmington and Amy his wife call to warrant against Alan of Boulogne concerning an assize of mort d' ancestor by Ivo of Diddington in the morrow of Saint John the Baptist [25 June] at Ware in the county of Herefordshire.--He pledged his faith. The same day is given at the bench to Marjery, John's wife, and Richard and Amy through their attorney. None of the regonitors came. So the sheriff shall have their bodies[there at the same term]. Marjery appoints as her attorney John of Finchingfield.-- Afterwards, Richard comes and appoints as his attorneys Ralph of Stevington or John of Cambridge. He removed John clerk who [was] the previous [attorney].
[Cross-reference: B480]

Essonia de malo veniendi capta apud Ware in Crastino sancti Johannis Baptiste.

Essoins of Sickness Preveting Travel Taken at Ware on the Morrow of Saint John the Baptist [25 June].

B479.(Heref, no +) Adam de Magna Hormed' versus Katerinam filiam Henrici le Merker' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Ricardum de Dovor'. A die sancti Johannis Baptiste in quindecim dies apud *Westmonasterium*. Affidavit. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat recognitores eiusdem assise ad predictum terminum.

B479.(Herefordshire, a new one) Adam of Great Hormead against Katherine daughter of Henry le Merker concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Richard of Dover, in the quindene of Saint John the Baptist [8 July] at *Westminster*. He pledged his faith. The sheriff is ordered to make the recognitors of the assize come at that term.

B480.(Hunt', ve +, +) (Johannes le Clerk attornatus Amicie (habet virum uxor Ricardiⁱ)^c) de Hemington versus Alanum de Bolon' de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Bartholomeum filium Johannis a die sancti Johannis (Baptiste in quindecim dies apud^c) *Westmonasterium*. Post venit attornatus (Amicieⁱ) (idem dies datus est Ricardo de Hemington' viro predicte Amicie^c) per attornatos suos. Et sciendum quod predictus Johannes de Litlebyr' alias se essoniat apud Cant', scilicet in Octabis sancte Trinitatis. Johannes de Finchingfeld' attornatus Margerie (habet virumⁱ) uxoris Johannis de Litlebyr' quam predicti Ricardus et Amicia vocat ad warantum simul cum predicto Johanni viro suo versus eundem Alanum de eodem per Willelmum de Dudington'. A die sancti Johannis (Baptiste in quindecim dies

apud Westmonasterium. Affidavit.ⁱ⁾ Idem dies datus est Johannis viro ipsius Margerie per attornatos suos (et similiter predictis Ricardo et Amicie per attornatos suos.ⁱ⁾ in Banco. Et retornetur istud placiatum coram justiciariis ubicumque etc. Et nullus recognitorum venerunt. Ideo vicecomes habeat corpora ad eundem terminum.

- B480.(Huntingdonshire, an old one, +, cancelled) John le Clerk attorney for Amy, she has a husband, wife of Richard of Hemington against Alan of Boulogne concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Bartholomew son of John in the quindene of Saint John the Baptist at Westminster. Afterwards, Amy's attorney came, the same day is given Richard of Hemington, Amy's husband, through their attorney. It is known that John of Littlebury elsewhere essioned himself at Canterbury, namely in the octaves of Saint Trinity. John of Finchingfield attorney to Marjery, she has a husband, wife of John of Littelbury, whom Richard and Amy called to warrant, along with John her husband, against Alan concerning the same by William of Diddington in the quindene of Saint John the Baptist at Westminster. He pledged his faith. The same day is given John through his attorney and likewise Richard and Amy through their attorney at the bench. The plea is to be returned before the justices wherever etc. None of the recognitors came. So the sheriff is ordered to have their bodies at the same term.
[Cross-reference: B478]

Essonia de malo veniendi capta apud Westmonasterium die Martis, scilicet die beate Marie Magdaline anno xliii.

Essoins of Sickness Preventing Travel Taken at Westminster on Tuesday, namely on the Day of the Blessed Mary Magdaline year 43 [22 July 1259].

- B481.(Midd', no +, Ex jur') Lucia (habet virumⁱ⁾ uxor Henrici de Belegrave versus Emmam filiam Willelmi le Panur de placito assise mortis antecessoris per Nicholaum Revel die dominica post festum beate Marie Magdaline. Affidavit. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem. Idem dies datus est--(^e)-Henrico viro predictae Lucie in Banco.

- B481.(Middlesex, a new one, exaction of the jurors) Lucy, she has a husband, wife of Henry of Belgrave against Emma daughter of William le Panner concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Nicholas Revel, on the Sunday after the feast of the Blessed Mary Magdaline [27 July]. She pledged her faith. The writ remains with the sheriff. The same day is given Henry, Lucy's husband, at the bench.
[Cross-reference: B482]

Essonia capta die dominica proximo ante festum sancti Petri ad vincula, anno xliii, apud Westmonasterium.

Essoins Taken on the First Sunday before the Feast of Saint Peter's Chains year 43 [27 July 1259] at Westminster.

- B482.(Midd', ve +, Ex jur') Henricus de Belegrave versus Emmam filiam Willelmi le Panur de placito mortis antecessoris per Reginaldum de sancto Albane die veneris scilicet die sancti Petri ad vincula apud Westmonasterium. Affidavit. Idem dies datus est Lucie uxori predicti Henrici in Banco. Et sciendum quod eadem Lucia alias se essoniat scilicet die Martis in festo beate Marie Magdaline. Et breve remaneat penes vicecomitem.

- B482.(Middlesex, an old one, exaction of the jurors) Henry of Belgrave against Emma daughter of William le Panner concerning a plea of mort d' ancestor by Reginald of Saint Albans, on Friday, namely on the day of Saint Peter's Chains [1 August] at Westminster. He pledged his faith. The same day is given Lucy, Henry's wife, at the bench. It is known that Lucy, elsewhere, essioned herself, namely on the Tuesday during the feast of the Blessed Mary Magdaline [22 July]. The writ remains with the sheriff.
[Cross-reference: B481]

